DIRAC OPERATOR AND SPECTRAL GEOMETRY

hep-th/9704016

Giampiero Esposito

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli, Mostra d'Oltremare Padiglione 20, 80125 Napoli, Italy;

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Mostra d'Oltremare Padiglione 19, 80125 Napoli, Italy.

arXiv:hep-th/9704016v3 16 Dec 2000

Abstract. This paper is devoted to mathematical and physical properties of the Dirac operator and spectral geometry. Spin-structures in Lorentzian and Riemannian manifolds, and the global theory of the Dirac operator, are first analyzed. Elliptic boundary-value problems, index problems for closed manifolds and for manifolds with boundary, Bott periodicity and K-theory are then presented. This makes it clear why the Dirac operator is the most fundamental, in the theory of elliptic operators on manifolds. The topic of spectral geometry is developed by studying non-local boundary conditions of the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer type, and heat-kernel asymptotics for operators of Laplace type on manifolds with boundary. The emphasis is put on the functorial method, which studies the behaviour of differential operators, boundary operators and heat-kernel coefficients under conformal rescalings of the background metric. In the second part, a number of relevant physical applications are studied: non-local boundary conditions for massless spin-1/2 fields, massless spin-3/2 potentials on manifolds with boundary, geometric theory of massive spin-3/2 potentials, local boundary conditions in quantum supergravity, quark boundary conditions, one-loop quantum cosmology, conformally covariant operators and Euclidean quantum gravity.

CHAPTER ONE

DIRAC OPERATOR IN PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS

Abstract. This introductory chapter begins with a review of Dirac's original derivation of the relativistic wave equation for the electron. The emphasis in then put on spin-structures in Lorentzian and Riemannian manifolds, and on the global theory of the Dirac operator, to prepare the ground for the topics studied in the following chapters.

1.1 The Dirac equation

In the development of theoretical physics, the Dirac operator finds its natural place in the attempt to obtain a relativistic wave equation for the electron. Although we shall be mainly concerned with elliptic operators in the rest of our book, we thus devote this section to Dirac's original argument (Dirac 1928, Dirac 1958). Indeed, it is well known that the relativistic Hamiltonian of a particle of mass m is

$$H = c\sqrt{m^2c^2 + p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2} \quad , \tag{1.1.1}$$

and this leads to the wave equation

$$\left[p_0 - \sqrt{m^2c^2 + p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2}\right]\psi = 0 \quad , \tag{1.1.2}$$

where the p_μ should be regarded as operators:

$$p_\mu \equiv i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \quad . \tag{1.1.3}$$

Thus, multiplication of Eq. (1.1.2) on the left by the operator

$$p_0 + \sqrt{m^2c^2 + p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2}$$

leads to the equation

$$\left[p_0^2 - m^2c^2 - p_1^2 - p_2^2 - p_3^2\right]\psi = 0 \quad , \tag{1.1.4}$$

which, being relativistically invariant, is a more appropriate starting point for a relativistic theory. Of course, equations (1.1.2) and (1.1.4) are not completely equivalent: every solution of Eq. (1.1.2) is also, by construction, a solution of Eq. (1.1.4), whereas the converse does not hold. Only the solutions of Eq. (1.1.4) corresponding to positive values of p_0 are also solutions of Eq. (1.1.2).

However, Eq. (1.1.4), being quadratic in p_0, is not of the form desirable in quantum mechanics, where, since the derivation of Schrödinger's equation

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = H\psi \quad , \tag{1.1.5}$$

one is familiar with the need to obtain wave equations which are linear in p_0. To combine relativistic invariance with linearity in p_0, and to obtain equivalence with Eq. (1.1.4), one looks for a wave equation which is rational and linear in p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3:

$$\Big[p_0 - \alpha_1 p_1 - \alpha_2 p_2 - \alpha_3 p_3 - \beta\Big]\psi = 0 \quad , \tag{1.1.6}$$

where α and β are independent of p. Since we are studying the (idealized) case when the electron moves in the absence of electromagnetic field, all space-time points are equivalent, and hence the operator in square brackets in Eq. (1.1.6) is independent of x. This implies in turn that α and β are independent of x, and commute with p and x operators. At a deeper level, α and β make it possible to obtain a relativistic description of the spin of the electron, i.e. an angular momentum which does not result from the translational motion of the electron.

At this stage, one can multiply Eq. (1.1.6) on the left by the operator

$$p_0 + \alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2 + \alpha_3 p_3 + \beta \quad .$$

This leads to the equation

$$\Bigg[p_0^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{3}\alpha_i^2 p_i^2 - \sum_{i\neq j}(\alpha_i\ \alpha_j + \alpha_j\ \alpha_i)p_i p_j$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{3}(\alpha_i\ \beta + \beta\ \alpha_i)p_i - \beta^2\Bigg]\psi = 0 \quad . \tag{1.1.7}$$

The equations (1.1.4) and (1.1.7) agree if α_i and β satisfy the conditions

$$\alpha_i^2 = 1 \ \ \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \quad , \tag{1.1.8}$$

$$\alpha_i\ \alpha_j + \alpha_j\ \alpha_i = 0 \ \text{ if } \ i \neq j \quad , \tag{1.1.9}$$

$$\beta^2 = m^2 c^2 \quad , \tag{1.1.10}$$

$$\alpha_i \, \beta + \beta \, \alpha_i = 0 \;\; \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \quad . \tag{1.1.11}$$

Thus, on setting

$$\beta = \alpha_0 mc \quad , \tag{1.1.12}$$

it is possible to re-express the properties (1.1.8)–(1.1.11) by the single equation

$$\alpha_a \, \alpha_b + \alpha_b \, \alpha_a = 2\delta_{ab} \;\; \forall a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3 \quad . \tag{1.1.13}$$

So far, we have found that, if Eq. (1.1.13) holds, the wave equation (1.1.6) is equivalent to Eq. (1.1.4). Thus, one can *assume* that Eq. (1.1.6) is the correct relativistic wave equation for the motion of an electron in the absence of a field. However, Eq. (1.1.6) is not entirely equivalent to Eq. (1.1.2), but, as Dirac first pointed out, it allows solutions corresponding to negative as well as positive values of p_0. The former are relevant for the theory of positrons, and will not be discussed in our monograph, which focuses instead on mathematical problems in the theory of elliptic operators.

To obtain a representation of four anticommuting α's, as in Eq. (1.1.13), one has to consider 4×4 matrices. Following Dirac, it is convenient to express the α's in terms of generalized Pauli matrices (see below), here denoted by $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$, and of a second set of anticommuting matrices, ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 say. Explicitly, one may take

$$\alpha_1 = \rho_1 \, \sigma_1 \quad , \tag{1.1.14}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \rho_1 \, \sigma_2 \quad , \tag{1.1.15}$$

$$\alpha_3 = \rho_1 \, \sigma_3 \quad , \tag{1.1.16}$$

$$\alpha_0 = \rho_3 \quad , \tag{1.1.17}$$

where (Dirac 1958)

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.1.18}$$

$$\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.1.19}$$

$$\sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.1.20}$$

$$\rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.1.21}$$

$$\rho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.1.22}$$

$$\rho_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.1.23}$$

Note that both the ρ's and the σ's are Hermitian, and hence the α's are Hermitian as well. In this formalism for the electron, the wave function has four components, and they all depend on the four x's only. Unlike the non-relativistic formalism with spin, one has two extra components which reflect the ability of Eq. (1.1.6) to describe negative-energy states.

By virtue of (1.1.14)–(1.1.17), Eq. (1.1.6) may be re-expressed as

$$\Big[p_0 - \rho_1 \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p} - \rho_3 mc\Big]\psi = 0 \quad . \tag{1.1.24}$$

The generalization to the case when an external electromagnetic field is present is not difficult. For this purpose, it is enough to bear in mind that

$$p_b = m v_b + \frac{e}{c} A_b \quad \forall b = 0, 1, 2, 3 \quad , \tag{1.1.25}$$

where A_b are such that $A_b dx^b$ is the connection one-form (or "potential") of the theory. By raising indices with the metric of the background space-time, one obtains the corresponding four-vector

$$A^b = g^{bc}\, A_c \quad . \tag{1.1.26}$$

The desired wave equation of the relativistic theory of the electron in an external electromagnetic field turns out to be

$$\left[p_0 + \frac{e}{c}A_0 - \rho_1\left(\vec{\sigma}, \vec{p} + \frac{e}{c}\vec{A}\right) - \rho_3 mc\right]\psi = 0 \quad . \tag{1.1.27}$$

With this notation, the wave function should be regarded as a column vector with four rows, while its "conjugate imaginary", say $\overline{\psi}^\dagger$, is a row vector, i.e. a 1×4 matrix, and obeys the equation

$$\overline{\psi}^\dagger \left[p_0 + \frac{e}{c}A_0 - \rho_1\left(\vec{\sigma}, \vec{p} + \frac{e}{c}\vec{A}\right) - \rho_3 mc\right] = 0 \quad , \tag{1.1.28}$$

where the momentum operators operate to the right.

1.2 Spinor Fields in Lorentzian Manifolds

A space-time (M, g) consists, by definition, of a connected, four-dimensional, Hausdorff C^∞ manifold M, jointly with a Lorentz metric g on M, and a time orientation given by a globally defined timelike vector field $X : M \to TM$. Indeed, two Lorentzian metrics on M are identified if they are related by the action of the diffeomorphism group of M. One is thus dealing with equivalence classes of pairs (M, g) as a mathematical model of the space-time manifold (Hawking and Ellis 1973). If a Levi-Civita connection, say ∇, is given on M, the corresponding Riemann curvature tensor is defined by

$$R(X, Y)Z \equiv \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X,Y]} Z \quad . \tag{1.2.1}$$

A curved space-time is a space-time manifold whose curvature tensor does not vanish, and represents, according to Einstein's general relativity, a good mathematical model of the world we live in (Hawking and Ellis 1973). We are now aiming to give an elementary introduction to the theory of spinor fields in a curved space-time, as a first step towards the theory of spinor fields in Riemannian manifolds (whose metric is positive-definite, instead of being Lorentzian).

For this purpose, recall that a *vierbein* is a collection of four oriented mutually orthogonal vectors $e^{\hat{a}}$, $\hat{a} = 0, 1, 2, 3$, whose components $e_a{}^{\hat{a}}$ are related to the metric tensor g_{ab} by

$$g_{ab}(x) = e_a{}^{\hat{c}}(x)\, e_b{}^{\hat{d}}(x)\, \eta_{\hat{c}\hat{d}} \quad , \tag{1.2.2}$$

where $\eta_{\hat{c}\hat{d}} = \mathrm{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$ is the Minkowski metric. The relation (1.2.2) is clearly preserved if the vierbein is replaced by its rotated form (Isham 1978):

$$e_a{}^{\hat{c}}(x) \to e_a{}^{\hat{b}}(x)\, \Omega_{\hat{b}}{}^{\hat{c}}(x) \quad , \tag{1.2.3}$$

where $\Omega_{\hat{b}}{}^{\hat{c}}$ is an *arbitrary* differentiable function on space-time, taking values in the group $SO(3,1)$. By definition, spinor fields in curved space-time are required to transform as Dirac spinors under this local gauge group. Thus, one *assumes* that $SL(2,C)$-valued functions exist, say S, such that

$$\Lambda(S(x)) = \Omega(x) \quad , \tag{1.2.4}$$

where Λ is the two-to-one covering map of $SL(2,C)$ onto $SO(3,1)$. In the Dirac representation of $SL(2,C)$, one has the matrix relation

$$S^{-1}\, \gamma_{\hat{a}}\, S = \gamma_{\hat{b}}\, \Omega_{\hat{a}}{}^{\hat{b}} \quad , \tag{1.2.5}$$

and the spinor fields transform as

$$\psi(x) \to S(x)\, \psi(x) \quad . \tag{1.2.6}$$

Covariant derivatives of spinor fields are defined according to the rules

$$\nabla_a \psi \equiv \Big(\partial_a + iB_a\Big)\psi \quad , \tag{1.2.7}$$

$$\nabla_a \overline{\psi} \equiv \partial_a \overline{\psi} - i\overline{\psi} B_a \quad , \tag{1.2.8}$$

where B_a, called the spin-connection, has the transformation property

$$B_a \to S B_a S^{-1} + i\Big(\partial_a S\Big) S^{-1} \quad , \tag{1.2.9}$$

and is defined by

$$B_a \equiv \frac{1}{4} B_{a\hat{c}\hat{d}} \left[\gamma^{\hat{c}}, \gamma^{\hat{d}}\right] \quad . \tag{1.2.10}$$

A suitable form of the components $B_{a\hat{c}\hat{d}}$ is obtained from Christoffel symbols according to the rule

$$B_{a\hat{c}\hat{d}} = \Gamma^c{}_{ab}\; e_{\hat{c}}{}^b\; e_{\hat{d}c} + e_{\hat{d}b}\; e^b{}_{\hat{c},a} \quad . \tag{1.2.11}$$

By virtue of (1.2.7)–(1.2.11), the gauge-invariant Lagrangian for a (massive) Dirac field is

$$\mathcal{L} = (\det e) \left[\frac{1}{2}\Big(\overline{\psi}\; \gamma_{\hat{c}}\; \nabla_a \psi - \Big(\nabla_a \overline{\psi}\Big)\gamma_{\hat{c}}\; \psi\Big) e^{a\hat{c}} - m\overline{\psi}\psi\right] \quad . \tag{1.2.12}$$

Some remarks are now in order (Isham 1978).

(i) Equation (1.2.4) does not hold, in general. The possibility to lift the arbitrary function Ω from $SO(3,1)$, which is not simply connected, to its simply connected covering group $SL(2,C)$, depends on the global topological structure of M. In other words, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the $SL(2,C)$-valued function S occurring in Eq. (1.2.4) is that (Spanier 1966)

$$\Omega_*\; \pi_1(M) = 0 \quad , \tag{1.2.13}$$

where $\pi_1(M)$ is the first homotopy group of space-time. The meaning of Eq. (1.2.13) is that the $SO(3,1)$ vierbein rotation Ω can be covered by a spinor gauge transformation if and only if *any* circle in M has an image in $SO(3,1)$ that can be contracted to a point. Indeed, if

$$\rho : \theta \in [0, 2\pi] \to \rho(\theta) \tag{1.2.14}$$

is a circle map in M (i.e. $\rho(0) = \rho(2\pi)$), then

$$\Omega : \theta \in [0, 2\pi] \to \Omega(\rho(\theta)) \tag{1.2.15}$$

is a circle map in $SO(3,1)$, and if ρ belongs to the equivalence class $[\rho] \in \pi_1(M)$ of homotopically related maps, then

$$\Omega_*[\rho]$$

denotes the homotopy class, in $\pi_1(SO(3,1))$, of the map (1.2.15). Thus, if M is not simply connected, there may be functions Ω for which the condition (1.2.13) is not respected.

(ii) The spin-connections corresponding to non-liftable vierbein rotations Ω are obtained by gauge rotations similar, in form, to (1.2.9), but with Ω replacing S. Thus, the gauge rotation can no longer be cancelled by a compensating transformation of spinor fields. This leads in turn to a number of possible Lagrangians, each of which is $SL(2,C)$ gauge-invariant, where the derivative terms in (1.2.12) are replaced by

$$\nabla_a \psi \to \Big(\partial_a + i\Omega B_a \Omega^{-1} - \Omega \partial_a \Omega^{-1}\Big)\psi \quad , \tag{1.2.16}$$

$$\nabla_a \overline{\psi} \to \Big(\partial_a - i\Omega B_a \Omega^{-1} + \Omega \partial_a \Omega^{-1}\Big)\overline{\psi} \quad , \tag{1.2.17}$$

and $e^{a\hat{c}}$ is replaced by $i\Omega^{\hat{c}}{}_{\hat{d}}\, e^{a\hat{d}}$, with Ω ranging over the equivalence classes of gauge functions. The number of different Lagrangians turns out to coincide with the number of elements in the cohomology group $H^1(M; Z_2)$. This is quite relevant for the path-integral approach to quantum gravity (cf. section 6.1), where one might have to "sum" over inequivalent vierbein gauge classes, as well as over metric tensors.

A spinor structure in a Lorentzian four-manifold can be defined as a principal $SL(2,C)$ bundle, say E, jointly with a bundle map f from E onto the principal $SO(3,1)$ bundle ξ of oriented orthonormal frames (the vierbeins of the literature

on general relativity). The map f has to be compatible with both the $SL(2,C)$ and $SO(3,1)$ actions, in that

$$f(pA) = f(p)\Lambda(A) \quad , \tag{1.2.18}$$

where p is *any* point in the bundle space of E, A is any $SL(2,C)$ group element, and pA is the spin-frame into which p is taken under the action of A. Moreover, $f(p)\Lambda(A)$ is the orthonormal frame into which $f(p)$ is taken by the $SO(3,1)$ element $\Lambda(A)$. *Spinor fields* are then the cross-sections of the vector bundle associated with the Dirac representation of $SL(2,C)$ on C^4. If spin-structures do not exist, one can, however, resort to the formalism of spin-c structures (Avis and Isham 1980).

1.3 Spin-Structures: Riemannian Case

In the course of defining spin-structures on Riemannian manifolds, we want to give a precise formulation of the following basic ideas. One is given an oriented Riemannian manifold, say M. The tangent bundle of M, TM, has the rotation group $SO(n)$ as structural group. If it is possible to replace $SO(n)$ by its two-fold covering group $Spin(n)$ (cf. appendix 1.A for the case $n = 3$), one then says that M can be given a spin-structure.

Following Milnor 1963, we start from a principal bundle, say ξ, over a Riemannian manifold B, with total space denoted by $E(\xi)$. The structural group of ξ is assumed to be $SO(n)$, where n can be *any* positive integer, including $n = \infty$. By definition, a *spin-structure* on ξ is a pair (η, f) consisting of

(i) A principal bundle η over B, with total space $E(\eta)$ and structural group coinciding with $Spin(n)$, i.e. the double covering of $SO(n)$;

(ii) A map $f : E(\eta) \to E(\xi)$ such that

$$f\ \rho_1 = \rho_2(f \times \lambda) \quad , \tag{1.3.1}$$

where λ is the homomorphism from $Spin(n)$ to $SO(n)$, ρ_1 is the right action of $Spin(n)$ and ρ_2 is the right action of $SO(n)$. In other words, there exist two equivalent ways to reach the total space of the given principal bundle ξ over B. First, one goes from $E(\eta) \times Spin(n)$ to $E(\eta)$ via right translation, then using the projection map from $E(\eta)$ to $E(\xi)$. However, one can also use the projection map $f \times \lambda$ from $E(\eta) \times Spin(n)$ to $E(\xi) \times SO(n)$. At this stage, one takes advantage of right translation to go from $E(\xi) \times SO(n)$ to the total space of ξ. A naturally occurring question is how to identify (or distinguish among) spin-structures. The answer is contained in the definition according to which a second spin-structure on ξ, say (η', f') should be identified with (η, f) if there exists an isomorphism h from η' to η such that $f \cdot h = f'$.

In the particular case when $n = 2$, one deals with $Spin(2)$, the two-fold covering group of the circle $SO(2)$; when $n = 1$, one deals with $Spin(1)$, a cyclic group of order 2. Useful examples are given by the tangent bundle of the two-sphere S^2. This has a unique spin-structure (η, f), where $E(\eta)$ is a three-sphere. The tangent bundle of the circle S^1 has instead two distinct spin-structures.

If the reader is more familiar with (or prefers) cohomology classes, he may follow Hirsch and Milnor by giving the following alternative definition:

A spin-structure on ξ is a cohomology class $\sigma \in H^1\Big(E(\xi); Z_2\Big)$ (here, of course, Z_2 denotes the integers modulo 2), whose restriction to each fibre is a generator of the cyclic group $H^1(\text{Fibre}; Z_2)$.

In other words, the underlying idea is that each cohomology class belonging to $H^1\Big(E(\xi); Z_2\Big)$ determines a two-fold covering of $E(\xi)$. It is precisely this two-fold covering space that should be taken as the total space $E(\eta)$. The condition involving the restriction to each fibre ensures that each fibre is covered by a copy of $Spin(n)$, i.e. the unique two-fold covering of $SO(n)$. It can be shown that the two definitions are completely equivalent, and hence one is free to choose among the two.

Remarkably, a necessary and sufficient condition for an $SO(n)$ bundle to be endowed with a spin-structure is that its second Stiefel-Whitney class, $w_2(\xi)$, should vanish. Further to this, if $w_2(\xi) = 0$, the number of distinct spin-structures on ξ is equal to the number of elements in $H^1(B; Z_2)$. Indeed, if B is connected, this property follows from the exact sequence

$$0 \to H^1(B; Z_2) \to H^1(E(\xi); Z_2) \to H^1(SO(n); Z_2) \to H^2(B; Z_2) \quad ,$$

which can be extracted, in turn, from the spectral sequence of the fibration ξ (Milnor 1963).

By definition, a *spin-manifold* consists of an oriented Riemannian manifold M, jointly with a spin-structure on TM, the tangent bundle of M. More explicitly, if FM denotes the space of oriented orthonormal n-frames on M, one can think of the spin-structure as being a cohomology class $\sigma \in H^1(FM; Z_2)$, whose restriction to each fibre is non-trivial (for all integer values of n greater than 1). The resulting spin-manifold is then denoted by (M, σ). In particular, if M is simply connected, so that σ is uniquely determined, one simply says that M itself is a spin-manifold.

Dirac spinor fields on the n-dimensional manifold M^n are defined to be *cross-sections* of the vector bundle E^τ over M^n with typical fibre $\mathcal{C}^{2[n/2]}$ and structure group $Spin(n)$, where τ is the fundamental spinor representation of $Spin(n)$ (see section 1.4).

When one makes explicit calculations, it is necessary to express a spinor field and its covariant derivative with respect to a (local) orthonormal frame $\{\mathbf{e}_a\}_{a=1,\ldots,n}$ on M^n in components. Indeed, a metric connection ω induces a spin-connection on M^n, i.e. a connection on the spin-structure $Spin(M^n)$, and a covariant derivative for the cross-sections. Given a spinor, say ψ, the components of the spinor $\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_a}\psi$ in a set of linearly independent local cross-sections of E^τ (such a set is called a local spinor frame, and is denoted by $\{\theta_A\}$) are given by

$$\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_a}\psi\Big)^A = \mathbf{e}_a(\psi^A) - \frac{1}{2}\omega_{abc}\Big(\Sigma^{bc}\Big)^A{}_B\,\psi^B \quad , \tag{1.3.2}$$

where ω_{abc} are the connection coefficients in the frame $\mathbf{e}_a$. As is well known, such coefficients are defined by the condition

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_a}\mathbf{e}_b = \omega_{abc}\mathbf{e}_c \quad . \tag{1.3.3}$$

The matrices Σ^{ab} are the generators of the representation τ of $Spin(n)$. They can be expressed by the equation (cf. (1.2.10))

$$\Sigma^{ab} = \frac{1}{4}\Big[\Gamma^a, \Gamma^b\Big] \quad , \tag{1.3.4}$$

where Γ^a are Dirac matrices satisfying (cf. (1.1.13))

$$\Gamma^a\ \Gamma^b + \Gamma^b\ \Gamma^a = 2\delta^{ab}\mathbb{1} \quad . \tag{1.3.5}$$

With this notation, $\mathbb{1}$ is the unit matrix, the indices a, b range from 1 through n, and the Dirac matrices should be thought of as carrying yet further indices A, B:

$$\Gamma^a = \Big(\Gamma^a\Big)^{A}_{\ B} \quad ,$$

where A and B range from 1 through $2^{[n/2]}$. The action of the Dirac operator on a spinor is then defined by the equation

$$\nabla\psi = \Gamma^a\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_a}\ \psi \quad . \tag{1.3.6}$$

At this stage, it is appropriate to build a global theory of the Dirac operator in the elliptic case. This is performed in the following section (cf. section 2.4).

1.4 Global Theory of the Dirac Operator

In Riemannian four-geometries, the *total* Dirac operator may be defined as a first-order elliptic operator mapping smooth sections of a complex vector bundle to smooth sections of the same bundle. Its action on the sections (i.e. the

spinor fields) is given by composition of Clifford multiplication with covariant differentiation. To understand these statements, we first summarize the properties of connections on complex vector bundles, and we then use the basic properties of spin-structures which enable one to understand how to construct the vector bundle relevant for the theory of the Dirac operator.

A complex vector bundle (Chern 1979) is a bundle whose fibres are isomorphic to complex vector spaces. Denoting by E the total space, by M the base space, one has the projection map $\pi : E \to M$ and the sections $s : M \to E$ such that the composition of π with s yields the identity on the base space: $\pi \cdot s = \mathrm{id}_M$. The sections s represent the physical fields in our applications. Moreover, denoting by T and T^* the tangent and cotangent bundles of M respectively, a connection ∇ is a map from the space of smooth sections of E, say $\Gamma(E)$ (also denoted by $C^\infty(M, E)$), to the space of smooth sections of the tensor-product bundle $\Gamma(T^* \otimes E)$:

$$\nabla : \Gamma(E) \to \Gamma(T^* \otimes E) \quad ,$$

such that the following properties hold:

$$\nabla(s_1 + s_2) = \nabla s_1 + \nabla s_2 \quad , \tag{1.4.1}$$

$$\nabla(fs) = df \otimes s + f\nabla s \quad , \tag{1.4.2}$$

where $s_1, s_2, s \in \Gamma(E)$ and f is any C^∞ function. The action of the connection ∇ is expressed in terms of the connection matrix θ as

$$\nabla s = \theta \otimes s \quad . \tag{1.4.3}$$

If one takes a section s' related to s by

$$s' = h\, s \quad , \tag{1.4.4}$$

in the light of (1.4.2)–(1.4.4) one finds by comparison that

$$\theta' h = d\, h + h\, \theta \quad . \tag{1.4.5}$$

Moreover, the transformation law of the curvature matrix

$$\Omega \equiv d\theta - \theta \wedge \theta \quad , \tag{1.4.6}$$

is found to be

$$\Omega' = h\ \Omega\ h^{-1} \quad . \tag{1.4.7}$$

We can now describe in more detail the spin-structures and the corresponding complex vector bundle acted upon by the total Dirac operator. Let X be a compact oriented differentiable n-dimensional manifold (without boundary) on which a Riemannian metric is introduced. Let Q be the principal tangential $SO(n)$-bundle of X. As we know from section 1.3, a spin-structure of X is a principal $Spin(n)$-bundle P over X together with a covering map $\widetilde{\pi} : P \to Q$ such that the following commutative structure exists. Given the Cartesian product $P \times Spin(n)$, one first reaches P by the right action of $Spin(n)$ on P, and one finally arrives at Q by the projection map $\widetilde{\pi}$. This is equivalent to first reaching the Cartesian product $Q \times SO(n)$ by the map $\widetilde{\pi} \times \rho$, and finally arriving at Q by the right action of $SO(n)$ on Q. Of course, by ρ we denote the double covering $Spin(n) \to SO(n)$. In other words, P and Q as above are principal fibre bundles over X, and one has a commutative diagram with $P \times Spin(n)$ and P on the top, and $Q \times SO(n)$ and Q on the bottom. The projection map from $P \times Spin(n)$ to $Q \times SO(n)$ is $\widetilde{\pi} \times \rho$, and the projection map from P to Q is $\widetilde{\pi}$. Horizontal arrows should be drawn to denote the right action of $Spin(n)$ on P on the top, and of $SO(n)$ on Q on the bottom. This coincides with the picture resulting from Eq. (1.3.1), apart from the different notation used therein.

The group $Spin(n)$ has a complex representation space Σ of dimension 2^n called the spin-representation. If $G \in Spin(n), x \in \Re^n, u \in \Sigma$, one has therefore

$$G(xu) = GxG^{-1} \cdot G(u) = \rho(G)x \cdot G(u) \quad , \tag{1.4.8}$$

where $\rho : Spin(n) \to SO(n)$ is the covering map as we said before. If X is even-dimensional, i.e. $n = 2l$, the representation is the direct sum of two irreducible

representations $\Sigma^{\pm}$ of dimension 2^{n-1}. If X is a $Spin(2l)$ manifold with principal bundle P, one can form the associated complex vector bundles

$$E^{+} \equiv P \times \Sigma^{+} \quad , \tag{1.4.9}$$

$$E^{-} \equiv P \times \Sigma^{-} \quad , \tag{1.4.10}$$

$$E \equiv E^{+} \oplus E^{-} \quad . \tag{1.4.11}$$

Sections of these vector bundles are spinor fields on X.

The *total* Dirac operator is a first-order elliptic differential operator $D : \Gamma(E) \to \Gamma(E)$ defined as follows. Recall first that the Riemannian metric defines a natural $SO(2l)$ connection, and this may be used to give a connection for P. One may therefore consider the connection ∇ at the beginning of this section, i.e. a linear map from $\Gamma(E)$ to $\Gamma(T^{*} \otimes E)$. On the other hand, the tangent and cotangent bundles of X are isomorphic, and one has the map from $\Gamma(T \otimes E) \to \Gamma(E)$ induced by *Clifford multiplication* (see section 2.1) The total Dirac operator D is defined to be the *composition* of these two maps. Thus, in terms of an orthonormal base e_i of T, one has *locally*

$$Ds = \sum_i e_i(\nabla_i s) \quad , \tag{1.4.12}$$

where $\nabla_i s$ is the covariant derivative of $s \in \Gamma(E)$ in the direction e_i, and $e_i(\ )$ denotes Clifford multiplication. Moreover, the total Dirac operator D induces two operators

$$D^{+} : \Gamma(E^{+}) \to \Gamma(E^{-}) \quad , \tag{1.4.13}$$

$$D^{-} : \Gamma(E^{-}) \to \Gamma(E^{+}) \quad , \tag{1.4.14}$$

each of which is elliptic. It should be emphasized that ellipticity of the total and partial Dirac operators only holds in Riemannian manifolds, whereas it does not apply to the Lorentzian manifolds of general relativity and of the original Dirac's theory of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles (cf. sections 1.1 and 1.2).

1.A Appendix

This appendix describes in detail the simplest example of two-to-one homomorphism which is relevant for the theory of spin and spin-structures. Our presentation follows closely the one in Wigner 1959, which relies in turn on a method suggested by H. Weyl. We begin with some elementary results in the theory of matrices, which turn out to be very useful for our purposes.

(i) A matrix which transforms every real vector into a real vector is itself real, i.e. all its elements are real. If this matrix is applied to the kth unit vector (which has kth component = 1, all others vanishing), the result is the vector which forms the kth row of the matrix. Thus, this row must be real. But this argument can be applied to all k, and hence all the rows of the matrix must be real.

(ii) It is also well known that a matrix O is complex orthogonal if it preserves the scalar product of two arbitrary vectors, i.e. if

$$(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = (\mathcal{O}\vec{a}, \mathcal{O}\vec{b}) \quad . \tag{1.A.1}$$

An equivalent condition can be stated in terms of one arbitrary vector: a matrix $\mathcal{O}$ is complex orthogonal if the length of every single arbitrary vector, say $\vec{v}$, is left unchanged under transformation by $\mathcal{O}$. Consider now two arbitrary vectors $\vec{a}$ and $\vec{b}$, and write $\vec{v} = \vec{a} + \vec{b}$. Then our condition for the complex orthogonality of $\mathcal{O}$ is

$$(\vec{v}, \vec{v}) = (\mathcal{O}\vec{v}, \mathcal{O}\vec{v}) \quad . \tag{1.A.2}$$

By virtue of the symmetry of the scalar product: $(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = (\vec{b}, \vec{a})$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{a} + \vec{b}, \vec{a} + \vec{b}) &= (\vec{a}, \vec{a}) + (\vec{b}, \vec{b}) + 2(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \\ &= (\mathcal{O}\vec{a}, \mathcal{O}\vec{a}) + (\mathcal{O}\vec{b}, \mathcal{O}\vec{b}) + 2(\mathcal{O}\vec{a}, \mathcal{O}\vec{b}) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{1.A.3}$$

However, complex orthogonality also implies that $(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) = (\mathcal{O}\vec{a}, \mathcal{O}\vec{a})$ and $(\vec{b}, \vec{b}) = (\mathcal{O}\vec{b}, \mathcal{O}\vec{b})$. It then follows from (1.A.3) that

$$(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = (\mathcal{O}\vec{a}, \mathcal{O}\vec{b}) \quad , \tag{1.A.4}$$

which implies that $\mathcal{O}$ is complex orthogonal. It can be shown, in a similar way, that $\mathcal{U}$ is unitary if only $(\vec{v},\vec{v}) = (\mathcal{U}\vec{v},\mathcal{U}\vec{v})$ holds for every vector.

By definition, a matrix which leaves each real vector real, and leaves the length of every vector unchanged, is a *rotation*. Indeed, when all lengths are equal in the original and transformed figures, the angles also must be equal; hence the transformation is merely a rotation.

(iii) We now want to determine the general form of a two-dimensional unitary matrix

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.A.5}$$

of determinant $+1$ by considering the elements of the product

$$\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^{\dagger} = \mathbb{1} \quad . \tag{1.A.6}$$

Recall that the $\dagger$ operation means taking the complex conjugate and then the transposed of the original matrix. Thus, the condition (1.A.6) implies that

$$a^{*}c + b^{*}d = 0 \quad , \tag{1.A.7}$$

which leads to $c = -b^{*}d/a^{*}$. The insertion of this result into the condition of unit determinant:

$$ad - bc = 1 \quad , \tag{1.A.8}$$

yields $\Big(aa^{*} + bb^{*}\Big)d/a^{*} = 1$. Moreover, since $aa^{*} + bb^{*} = 1$ from (1.A.6), it follows that $d = a^{*}$ and $c = -b^{*}$. The general two-dimensional unitary matrix with unit determinant is hence

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b^{*} & a^{*} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.A.9}$$

where, of course, we still have to require that $aa^{*} + bb^{*} = 1$. Note that, if one writes $a = y_0 + iy_3$ and $b = y_1 + iy_2$, one finds

$$\det\mathbf{u} = y_0^2 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2 = 1 \quad .$$

This is the equation of a unit three-sphere centred at the origin, which means that $SU(2)$ has three-sphere topology and is hence simply connected (the n-sphere is simply connected for all $n > 1$). More precisely, $SU(2)$ is homeomorphic to $S^3 \subset \Re^4$.

Consider now the so-called *Pauli matrices*:

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.A.10}$$

$$\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.A.11}$$

$$\sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.A.12}$$

Every two-dimensional matrix with zero trace, say $\mathbf{h}$, can be expressed as a linear combination of these matrices:

$$\mathbf{h} = x\sigma_x + y\sigma_y + z\sigma_z = (r, \sigma) \quad . \tag{1.A.13}$$

Explicitly, one has

$$\mathbf{h} = \begin{pmatrix} -z & x + iy \\ x - iy & z \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.A.14}$$

In particular, if x, y, and z are real, then $\mathbf{h}$ is Hermitian.

If one transforms $\mathbf{h}$ by an arbitrary unitary matrix $\mathbf{u}$ with unit determinant, one again obtains a matrix with zero trace, $\overline{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{uhu}^\dagger$. Thus, $\overline{\mathbf{h}}$ can also be written as a linear combination of $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$:

$$\overline{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{uhu}^\dagger = \mathbf{u}(r, \sigma)\mathbf{u}^\dagger = x'\sigma_x + y'\sigma_y + z'\sigma_z = (r', \sigma) \quad , \tag{1.A.15}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b^* & a^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -z & x + iy \\ x - iy & z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a^* & -b \\ b^* & a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -z' & x' + iy' \\ x' - iy' & z' \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.A.16}$$

Equation (1.A.16) determines x', y', z' as linear functions of x, y, z. The transformation R_u which carries $r = (x, y, z)$ into $R_u r = r' = (x', y', z')$ can be found from Eq. (1.A.16). It is

$$x' = \frac{1}{2}\Big(a^2 + a^{*2} - b^2 - b^{*2}\Big)x + \frac{i}{2}\Big(a^2 - a^{*2} + b^2 - b^{*2}\Big)y$$
$$+\Big(a^* b^* + ab\Big)z \quad , \tag{1.A.17}$$

$$y' = \frac{i}{2}\Big(a^{*2} - a^2 + b^2 - b^{*2}\Big)x + \frac{1}{2}\Big(a^2 + a^{*2} + b^2 + b^{*2}\Big)y$$
$$+ i\Big(a^* b^* - ab\Big)z \quad , \tag{1.A.18}$$

$$z' = -(a^* b + ab^*)x + i(a^* b - ab^*)y + (aa^* - bb^*)z \quad . \tag{1.A.19}$$

The particular form of the matrix R_u does not matter; it is important only that

$$x'^2 + y'^2 + z'^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 \quad , \tag{1.A.20}$$

since the determinants of $\overline{\mathbf{h}}$ and $\mathbf{h}$ are equal ($\mathbf{u}$ being an element of $SU(2)$). According to the analysis in (ii), this implies that the transformation R_u must be complex orthogonal. Such a property can also be seen directly from (1.A.17)–(1.A.19).

Moreover, $\overline{\mathbf{h}}$ is Hermitian if $\mathbf{h}$ is. In other words, $r' = (x', y', z')$ is real if $r = (x, y, z)$ is real. This implies, by virtue of (i), that R_u is pure real, as can also be seen directly from (1.A.17)–(1.A.19). Thus, R_u is a rotation: every two-dimensional unitary matrix $\mathbf{u}$ of unit determinant corresponds to a three-dimensional rotation R_u; the correspondence is given by (1.A.15) or (1.A.16).

It should be stressed that the determinant of R_u is $+1$, since as $\mathbf{u}$ is changed continuously into a unit matrix, R_u goes continuously into the three-dimensional unit matrix. If its determinant were -1 at the beginning of this process, it would have to make the jump to $+1$. This is impossible, since the function "det" is continuous, and hence the matrices with negative determinant cannot be connected

to the identity of the group. As a corollary of these properties, R_u is a pure rotation for all $\mathbf{u}$.

The above correspondence is such that the product $\mathbf{qu}$ of two unitary matrices $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ corresponds to the product $R_{qu} = R_q \cdot R_u$ of the corresponding rotations. According to (1.A.15), applied to $\mathbf{q}$ instead of $\mathbf{u}$,

$$\mathbf{q}(r,\sigma)\mathbf{q}^\dagger = \Big(R_q r, \sigma\Big) \quad , \tag{1.A.21}$$

and upon transformation with $\mathbf{u}$ this yields

$$\mathbf{uq}(r,\sigma)\mathbf{q}^\dagger\mathbf{u}^\dagger = \mathbf{u}(R_q r,\sigma)\mathbf{u}^\dagger = (R_u R_q r,\sigma) = (R_{uq} r,\sigma) \quad , \tag{1.A.22}$$

using (1.A.15) again, with $R_q r$ replacing r and $\mathbf{uq}$ replacing $\mathbf{u}$. Thus, a homomorphism exists between the group of two-dimensional unitary matrices of determinant $+1$ (the "unitary group") and three-dimensional rotations; the correspondence is given by (1.A.15) or (1.A.17)–(1.A.19). Recall, by the way, that a homomorphism of two groups, say G_1 and G_2, is a map $\phi : G_1 \to G_2$ such that

$$\phi(g_1 \cdot g_2) = \phi(g_1)\ \phi(g_2) \quad ,$$

$$\phi\Big(\mathrm{e}_{G_1}\Big) = \phi\Big(\mathrm{e}_{G_2}\Big) \quad ,$$

$$\phi(g^{-1}) = (\phi(g))^{-1} \quad .$$

However, we note that so far we have not shown that the homomorphism exists between the two-dimensional unitary group and the *whole* pure rotation group. That would imply that R_u ranges over all rotations as $\mathbf{u}$ covers the entire unitary group. This will be proved shortly. It should also be noticed that the homomorphism *is not an isomorphism*, since more than one unitary matrix corresponds to the same rotation (see below).

We first assume that $\mathbf{u}$ is a diagonal matrix, say $\mathbf{u}_1(\alpha)$ (i.e. we set $b = 0$, and, for convenience, we write $a = e^{-\frac{i}{2}\alpha}$). Then $\mid a^2 \mid = 1$ and α is real:

$$\mathbf{u}_1(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{i}{2}\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.A.23}$$

From (1.A.17)–(1.A.19) one can see that the corresponding rotation:

$$R_{u_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha & 0 \\ -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.A.24}$$

is a rotation about Z through an angle α. We next assume that $\mathbf{u}$ is real:

$$\mathbf{u}_2(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\beta}{2} & -\sin\frac{\beta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\beta}{2} & \cos\frac{\beta}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.A.25}$$

From (1.A.17)–(1.A.19) the corresponding rotation is found to be

$$R_{u_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\beta & 0 & -\sin\beta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sin\beta & 0 & \cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{1.A.26}$$

i.e. a rotation about Y through an angle β. The product of the three unitary matrices $\mathbf{u}_1(\alpha)\mathbf{u}_2(\beta)\mathbf{u}_1(\gamma)$ corresponds to the product of a rotation about Z through an angle γ, about Y through β, and about Z through α, in other words, to a rotation with Euler angles α, β, γ. It follows from this that the correspondence defined in (1.A.15) not only specified a three-dimensional rotation for every two-dimensional unitary matrix, but also *at least one unitary matrix* for every pure rotation. Specifically, the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{i}{2}\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\beta}{2} & -\sin\frac{\beta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\beta}{2} & \cos\frac{\beta}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{i}{2}\gamma} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}\alpha}\cos\frac{\beta}{2}e^{-\frac{i}{2}\gamma} & -e^{-\frac{i}{2}\alpha}\sin\frac{\beta}{2}e^{\frac{i}{2}\gamma} \\ e^{\frac{i}{2}\alpha}\sin\frac{\beta}{2}e^{-\frac{i}{2}\gamma} & e^{\frac{i}{2}\alpha}\cos\frac{\beta}{2}e^{\frac{i}{2}\gamma} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{1.A.27}$$

corresponds to the rotation $\{\alpha\beta\gamma\}$. Thus, the homomorphism is in fact a homomorphism of the unitary group onto the *whole* three-dimensional pure rotation group.

The question remains of the *multiplicity* of the homomorphism, i.e. how many unitary matrices $\mathbf{u}$ correspond to the same rotation. For this purpose, it is sufficient to check how many unitary matrices $\mathbf{u}_0$ correspond to the identity

of the rotation group, i.e. to the transformation $x' = x, y' = y, z' = z$. For these particular $\mathbf{u}_0$'s, the identity $\mathbf{u}_0\mathbf{h}\mathbf{u}_0^\dagger = \mathbf{h}$ should hold for all $\mathbf{h}$; this can only be the case when $\mathbf{u}_0$ is a constant matrix: $b = 0$ and $a = a^*$, $\mathbf{u}_0 = \pm\mathbb{1}$ (since $\mid a \mid^2 + \mid b \mid^2 = 1$). Thus, the two unitary matrices $+\mathbb{1}$ and $-\mathbb{1}$, and *only these*, correspond to the identity of the rotation group. These two elements form an invariant subgroup of the unitary group, and those elements (and only those) which are in the same coset of the invariant subgroup, i.e. $\mathbf{u}$ and $-\mathbf{u}$, correspond to the same rotation. Indeed, that $\mathbf{u}$ and $-\mathbf{u}$ actually do correspond to the same rotation can be seen directly from (1.A.15) or (1.A.17)–(1.A.19).

Alternatively, one can simply note that only the half-Euler-angles occur in (1.A.27). The Euler angles are determined by a rotation only up to a multiple of 2π; the half angles, only up to a multiple of π. This implies that the trigonometric functions in (1.A.27) are determined only up to a sign.

A very important result has been thus obtained: there exists a two-to-one homomorphism of the group of two-dimensional unitary matrices with determinant 1 *onto* the three-dimensional pure rotation group: there is a one-to-one correspondence between *pairs* of unitary matrices $\mathbf{u}$ and $-\mathbf{u}$ and rotations R_u in such a way that, from $\mathbf{uq} = \mathbf{t}$ it also follows that $R_u R_q = R_t$; conversely, from $R_u R_q = R_t$, one has that $\mathbf{uq} = \pm\mathbf{t}$. If the unitary matrix $\mathbf{u}$ is known, the corresponding rotation is best obtained from (1.A.17)–(1.A.19). Conversely, the unitary matrix for a rotation $\{\alpha\beta\gamma\}$ is best found from (1.A.27) (Wigner 1959).

CHAPTER TWO

DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS ON MANIFOLDS

Abstract. Clifford algebras play a key role in the definition of the Dirac operator. Thus, the chapter begins with a definition of the Clifford algebra of a vector space equipped with a non-degenerate quadratic form. Clifford groups and Pin groups are also briefly introduced. The following sections are devoted to the Laplace operator, the signature operator and an intrinsic definition of ellipticity and index. The chapter ends with a brief review of properties of the Dirac operator, first in Euclidean space and then on compact, oriented, even-dimensional Riemannian manifolds.

2.1 Clifford Algebras

Let V be a real vector space equipped with an inner product $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$, defined by a non-degenerate quadratic form Q of signature (p,q). Let $T(V)$ be the tensor algebra of V and consider the ideal $\mathcal{I}$ in $T(V)$ generated by $x\otimes x+Q(x)$. By definition, $\mathcal{I}$ consists of sums of terms of the kind $a\otimes\Big\{x\otimes x+Q(x)\Big\}\otimes b$, $x\in V, a, b\in T(V)$. The quotient space

$$Cl(V)\equiv Cl(V,Q)\equiv T(V)/\mathcal{I} \tag{2.1.1}$$

is the *Clifford algebra* of the vector space V equipped with the quadratic form Q. The product induced by the tensor product in $T(V)$ is known as Clifford multiplication or the Clifford product and is denoted by $x\cdot y$, for $x,y\in Cl(V)$. The dimension of $Cl(V)$ is 2^n if $\dim(V)=n$. A basis for $Cl(V)$ is given by the scalar 1 and the products

$$e_{i_1}\cdot e_{i_2}\cdot e_{i_n}\quad i_1<...<i_n\quad ,$$

where $\Big\{e_1,...,e_n\Big\}$ is an orthonormal basis for V. Moreover, the products satisfy (cf. (1.1.13))

$$e_i\cdot e_j+e_j\cdot e_i=0\quad i\neq j\quad , \tag{2.1.2}$$

$$e_i\cdot e_i=-2\langle e_i,e_i\rangle\quad i=1,...,n\quad . \tag{2.1.3}$$

As a vector space, $Cl(V)$ is isomorphic to $\Lambda^*(V)$, the Grassmann algebra, with

$$e_{i_1}...e_{i_n}\longrightarrow e_{i_1}\wedge...\wedge e_{i_n}\quad .$$

There are two natural *involutions* on $Cl(V)$. The first, denoted by $\alpha: Cl(V)\to Cl(V)$, is induced by the involution $x\to -x$ defined on V, which extends to an automorphism of $Cl(V)$. The eigenspace of α with eigenvalue $+1$ consists of the even elements of $Cl(V)$, and the eigenspace of α of eigenvalue -1 consists of the odd elements of $Cl(V)$.

The second involution is a map $x \to x^t$, induced on generators by

$$\left(e_{i_1}...e_{i_p}\right)^t = e_{i_p}...e_{i_1} \quad ,$$

where e_i are basis elements of V. Moreover, we define $x \to \overline{x}$, a third involution of $Cl(V)$, by $\overline{x} \equiv \alpha(x^t)$.

One then defines $Cl^*(V)$ to be the group of invertible elements of $Cl(V)$, and the *Clifford group* $\Gamma(V)$ is the subgroup of $Cl^*(V)$ defined by

$$\Gamma(V) \equiv \left\{ x \in Cl^*(V) : y \in V \Rightarrow \alpha(x) y x^{-1} \in V \right\} \quad . \tag{2.1.4}$$

One can show that the map $\rho : V \to V$ given by $\rho(x)y = \alpha(x)yx^{-1}$ is an isometry of V with respect to the quadratic form Q. The map $x \to \|x\| \equiv x\overline{x}$ is the square-norm map, and enables one to define a remarkable subgroup of the Clifford group, i.e. (Ward and Wells 1990)

$$\mathrm{Pin}(V) \equiv \left\{ x \in \Gamma(V) : \|x\| = 1 \right\} \quad . \tag{2.1.5}$$

2.2 Exterior Differentiation and Hodge-Laplace Operator

Let X be an n-dimensional C^∞ manifold and let $\Omega^q(X)$ denote the space of C^∞ exterior differential forms of degree q on X. One then has a naturally occurring differential operator $d : \Omega^q(X) \to \Omega^{q+1}(X)$ which extends the differential of a function. The sequence (Atiyah 1975a)

$$0 \to \Omega^0(X) \to \Omega^1(X) \to ... \to \Omega^n(X) \to 0$$

is a complex in that $d^2 = 0$, and the main theorem of de Rham states that the cohomology of this complex is isomorphic to the cohomology of X, with real coefficients. In other words, if $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_N$ is a basis for the homology in dimension q,

then a q-form ω exists with $d\omega = 0$ having prescribed periods $\int_\omega \gamma_i$, and ω is unique modulo the addition of forms $d\theta$. In particular, if $X = \Re^n$, the corresponding $\Omega^q(X)$ can be identified with C^∞ maps $\Re^n \to \Lambda^q(\Re^{n*})$, and d becomes a constant-coefficient operator whose Fourier transform is exterior multiplication by $i\xi$, for $\xi \in (\Re^n)^*$.

If X is compact oriented, and a Riemannian metric is given on X, one can define a positive-definite inner product on $\Omega^q(X)$ by

$$\langle u, v\rangle \equiv \int_X u_\wedge * v \quad , \tag{2.2.1}$$

where $* : \Omega^q(X) \to \Omega^{n-q}(X)$ is the isomorphism given by the metric. By virtue of the identity

$$d\Big(u_\wedge * v\Big) = du_\wedge * v + (-1)^q u_\wedge d * v \quad , \tag{2.2.2}$$

where $u \in \Omega^q, v \in \Omega^{q-1}$, one gets

$$\int_X du_\wedge * v + (-1)^q \int_X u_\wedge d * v = 0 \quad . \tag{2.2.3}$$

This implies

$$\langle du, v\rangle = (-1)^{q+1}\langle u, *^{-1} d * v\rangle \quad . \tag{2.2.4}$$

Thus, the adjoint d^* of d on Ω^q is given by

$$d^* = (-1)^{q+1} *^{-1} d^* = \epsilon\ {}^*d^* \quad , \tag{2.2.5}$$

where ϵ may take the values ± 1 depending on n, q.

The corresponding Hodge-Laplace operator on Ω^q is therefore defined as

$$\triangle \equiv dd^* + d^*d \quad , \tag{2.2.6}$$

and the harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^q$ are the solutions of $\triangle u = 0$. The main theorem of Hodge theory is that $\mathcal{H}^q$ is isomorphic to the q-th de Rham group and hence to the q-th cohomology group of X.

2.3 Index of Elliptic Operators and Signature Operator

It is convenient to consider the operator $d + d^*$ acting on $\Omega^*(X) \equiv \oplus_q \Omega^q(X)$. Since $d^2 = (d^*)^2 = 0$, one has $\triangle = (d + d^*)^2$ and the harmonic forms are also the solutions of $(d + d^*)u = 0$. If we consider $d + d^*$ as an operator $\Omega^{\rm ev} \to \Omega^{\rm odd}$, its null-space is $\oplus \mathcal{H}^{2q}$, while the null-space of its adjoint is $\oplus \mathcal{H}^{2q+1}$. Hence its *index* is the Euler characteristic of X. It is now appropriate to define elliptic differential operators and their index.

Let us denote again by X a compact oriented smooth manifold, and by E, F two smooth complex vector bundles over X. We consider linear differential operators

$$D : \Gamma(E) \to \Gamma(F) \quad , \tag{2.3.1}$$

i.e. linear operators defined on the spaces of smooth sections and expressible locally by a matrix of partial derivatives. Note that the extra generality involved in considering vector bundles presents no serious difficulties and it is quite essential in a systematic treatment on manifolds, since all geometrically interesting operators operate on vector bundles.

Let $T^*(X)$ denote the cotangent vector bundle of X, $S(X)$ the unit sphere-bundle in $T^*(X)$ (relative to some Riemannian metric), $\pi : S(X) \to X$ the projection. Then, associated with D there is a vector-bundle homomorphism

$$\sigma(D) : \pi^* E \to \pi^* F \quad , \tag{2.3.2}$$

which is called the symbol of D. In terms of local coordinates, $\sigma(D)$ is obtained from D replacing $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ by $i\xi_j$ in the highest-order terms of D (ξ_j is the jth coordinate in the cotangent bundle). By definition, D is *elliptic* if $\sigma(D)$ is an *isomorphism*. Of course, this implies that the complex vector bundles E, F have the same dimension.

One of the basic properties of elliptic operators is that Ker D (i.e. the null-space) and Coker $D \equiv \Gamma(F)/D\Gamma(E)$ are both finite-dimensional. The *index* $\gamma(D)$ is defined by (Atiyah and Singer 1963)

$$\gamma(D) \equiv \dim \text{ Ker } D - \dim \text{ Coker } D \quad . \tag{2.3.3}$$

If $D^* : \Gamma(F) \to \Gamma(E)$ denotes the formal adjoint of D, relative to metrics in E, F, X, then D^* is also elliptic and

$$\text{Coker } D \cong \text{Ker } D^* \quad , \tag{2.3.4}$$

so that

$$\gamma(D) = \dim \text{Ker } D - \dim \text{Ker } D^* \quad . \tag{2.3.5}$$

Getting back to the definition of symbol, we find it helpful for the reader to say that, for the exterior derivative d, its symbol is exterior multiplication by $i\xi$, for $\triangle$ it is $-\|\xi\|^2$, and for $d + d^*$ it is iA_ξ, where A_ξ is Clifford multiplication by ξ.

For a given $\alpha \in \Lambda^p(\Re^{2l}) \otimes_\Re C$ (recall that $\Lambda^q(V)$ denotes the exterior powers of the vector space V), let us denote by τ the involution

$$\tau(\alpha) \equiv i^{p(p-1)+l} \, {}^*\alpha \quad . \tag{2.3.6}$$

If $n = 2l$, τ can be expressed as $i^l\omega$, where ω denotes Clifford multiplication by the volume form ^{*1}. Remarkably, $(d + d^*)$ and τ anti-commute. In the Clifford algebra one has $\xi\omega = -\omega\xi$ for $\xi \in T^*$. Thus, if $\Omega^\pm$ denote the ± 1-eigenspaces of τ, $(d + d^*)$ maps Ω^+ into Ω^-. The restricted operator

$$d + d^* : \Omega_+ \to \Omega_- \quad , \tag{2.3.7}$$

is called the *signature operator* and denoted by A. If $l = 2k$, the index of this operator is equal to $\dim \mathcal{H}_+ - \dim \mathcal{H}_-$, where $\mathcal{H}_\pm$ are the spaces of harmonic forms in $\Omega_\pm$. If $q \neq l$, the space $\mathcal{H}^q \oplus \mathcal{H}^{n-q}$ is stable under τ, which just interchanges the two factors. Hence one gets a vanishing contribution to the index from such a space. For $q = l = 2k$, however, one has $\tau(\alpha) = i^{l(l-1)+l} {}^*\alpha = {}^*\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Omega^l$. One thus finds

$$\text{index } A = \dim \mathcal{H}^l_+ - \dim \mathcal{H}^l_- \quad , \tag{2.3.8}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^l_\pm$ are the ± 1-eigenspaces of $*$ on $\mathcal{H}^l$. Thus, since the inner product in $\mathcal{H}^l$ is given by $\int u \wedge {}^*v$, one finds

$$\text{index } A = \text{Sign}(X) \quad , \tag{2.3.9}$$

where Sign(X) is the signature of the quadratic form on $H^{2k}(X;\Re)$. Hence the name for the operator A.

It is now worth recalling that the *cup-product* is a very useful algebraic structure occurring in cohomology theory. It works as follows. Given $[\omega] \in H^p(M;\Re)$ and $[\nu] \in H^q(M;\Re)$, then one defines the cup-product of $[\omega]$ and $[\nu]$, written $[\omega] \bigcup [\nu]$, by

$$[\omega] \bigcup [\nu] \equiv [\omega \wedge \nu] \quad . \tag{2.3.10}$$

The right-hand-side of (2.3.10) is a $(p+q)$-form so that $[\omega \wedge \nu] \in H^{p+q}(M;\Re)$. One can check, using the properties of closed and exact forms, that this is a well-defined product of cohomology classes. The cup-product $\bigcup$ is therefore a map of the form

$$\bigcup : H^p(M;\Re) \times H^q(M;\Re) \rightarrow H^{p+q}(M;\Re) \quad . \tag{2.3.11}$$

If the sum of all cohomology groups, $H^*(M;\Re)$, is defined by

$$H^*(M;\Re) \equiv \oplus_{p>0} H^p(M;\Re) \quad , \tag{2.3.12}$$

the cup-product has the neater looking form

$$\bigcup : H^*(M;\Re) \times H^*(M;\Re) \rightarrow H^*(M;\Re) \quad . \tag{2.3.13}$$

The product on $H^*(M;\Re)$ defined in (2.3.13) makes $H^*(M;\Re)$ into a ring. It can happen that two spaces M and N have the same cohomology groups and yet are not topologically the same. This can be proved by evaluating the cup-product $\bigcup$ for $H^*(M;\Re)$ and $H^*(N;\Re)$, and showing that the resulting rings are different. An example is provided by choosing $M \equiv S^2 \times S^4$ and $N \equiv CP^3$.

2.4 Dirac Operator

We begin our analysis by considering Euclidean space $\Re^{2k}$. The Clifford algebra $\widetilde{C}_{2k}$ of section 2.1 is a full matrix algebra acting on the 2^k-dimensional spin-space S. Moreover, S is given by the direct sum of S^+ and S^-, i.e. the eigenspaces

of $\omega = e_1 e_2 ... e_{2k}$, and $\omega = \pm i^k$ on $S^{\pm}$. Let us now denote by $E_1, ..., E_{2k}$ the linear transformations on S representing $e_1, ..., e_{2k}$. The Dirac operator is then defined as the first-order differential operator

$$D \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{2k} E_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \quad , \tag{2.4.1}$$

and satisfies $D^2 = -\triangle \cdot I$, where I is the identity of spin-space. Note that, since the e_i anti-commute with ω, the Dirac operator interchanges the positive and negative spin-spaces, S^+ and S^- (cf. appendix 6.A). Restriction to S^+ yields the operator

$$B : C^{\infty}\Big(\Re^{2k}, S^+\Big) \to C^{\infty}\Big(\Re^{2k}, S^-\Big) \quad . \tag{2.4.2}$$

Since $E_i^2 = -1$, in the standard metric the E_i are unitary and hence skew-adjoint. Moreover, since $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ is also formally skew-adjoint, it follows that D is formally self-adjoint, i.e. the formal adjoint of B is the restriction of D to S^-.

The next step is the global situation of a compact oriented $2k$-dimensional manifold X. First, we assume that a spin-structure exists on X. From section 1.3, this means that the principal $SO(2k)$ bundle P of X, consisting of oriented orthonormal frames, lifts to a principal $\mathrm{Spin}(2k)$ bundle Q, i.e. the map $Q \to P$ is a double covering inducing the standard covering $\mathrm{Spin}(2k) \to SO(2k)$ on each fibre. If $S^{\pm}$ are the two half-spin representations of $\mathrm{Spin}(2k)$, we consider the associated vector bundles on X: $E^{\pm} \equiv Q \times_{\mathrm{Spin}(2k)} S^{\pm}$. Sections of these vector bundles are the spinor fields on X. The *total* Dirac operator on X is a differential operator acting on $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$ and switching factors as above. To define D we have to use the Levi-Civita connection on P, which lifts to one on Q. This enables one to define the covariant derivative

$$\nabla : C^{\infty}\Big(X, E\Big) \to C^{\infty}\Big(X, E \otimes T^*\Big) \quad , \tag{2.4.3}$$

and D is defined as the composition of ∇ with the map $C^\infty(X, E \otimes T^*)\Big) \to C^\infty(X, E)$ induced by Clifford multiplication. By using an orthonormal base e_i of T at any point one can write (see (1.4.12))

$$Ds \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{2k} e_i \nabla_i s \quad , \tag{2.4.4}$$

where $\nabla_i s$ is the covariant derivative in the direction e_i, and $e_i(\ )$ denotes Clifford multiplication. By looking at symbols, D is skew-adjoint. Hence $D - D^*$ is an algebraic invariant of the metric and it only involves the first derivatives of g. Using normal coordinates one finds that any such invariant vanishes, which implies $D = D^*$, i.e. D is self-adjoint.

As in Euclidean space, the restriction of D to the half-spinors E^+ is denoted by

$$B : C^\infty\Big(X, E^+\Big) \to C^\infty\Big(X, E^-\Big) \quad . \tag{2.4.5}$$

The index of the restricted Dirac operator is given by

$$\text{index } B = \dim \mathcal{H}^+ - \dim \mathcal{H}^- \quad , \tag{2.4.6}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^\pm$ are the spaces of solutions of $Du = 0$, for u a section of $E^\pm$. Since D is elliptic and self-adjoint, these spaces are also the solutions of $D^2 u = 0$, and are called *harmonic spinors*.

2.5 Some Outstanding Problems

In the mathematical and physical applications of elliptic operators, one studies a mathematical framework given by (complex) vector bundles over a compact Riemannian manifold, say M, where M may or may not have a boundary. The latter case is simpler and came first in the (historical) development of index theory. The investigations in Atiyah and Singer 1968a, Atiyah and Segal 1968, Atiyah and

Singer 1968b, Atiyah and Singer 1971a–b, proved that the index of an elliptic operator (in general, one deals with elliptic systems) is obtained by integrating over the sphere-bundle of M a suitable composition of the Chern character with the Todd class of M (see section 3.1). In other words, a deep relation exists between the dimensions of the null-spaces of an elliptic operator and its adjoint on one hand, and the topological invariants of the fibre bundles of the problem on the other hand.

The classical Riemann-Roch problem, which is concerned with giving a formula for the dimension of the space of meromorphic functions on a compact Riemann surface, having poles of orders $\leq \nu_i$ at points P_i, may be viewed as an index problem. In other words, the solution of the index problem in general is equivalent to finding an extension of the Riemann-Roch theorem from the domain of holomorphic function theory to that of general elliptic systems (Atiyah 1966). In general, one has to find suitable topological invariants of the pair (M, D), where M is the base manifold and D is the elliptic operator. Moreover, the explicit formula for index(D) has to be expressed in terms of these invariants. In the particular case of the Riemann-Roch theorem, the desired topological invariants turn out to be the genus, and the degree of $\sum_i \nu_i P_i$.

It is now instructive to gain a qualitative understanding of why an elliptic operator, say D, defines invariants of the characteristic class type (Atiyah 1966). For this purpose, let us recall that a homogeneous, constant coefficient, $N \times N$ matrix of differential operators

$$P = \left[P_{ij}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} \right) \right] \quad , \quad i, j = 1, ..., N \quad , \tag{2.5.1}$$

is elliptic if, for $\xi = (\xi_1, ..., \xi_n) \neq 0$ (and real) one has

$$\det P(\xi_1, ..., \xi_n) \neq 0 \quad . \tag{2.5.2}$$

If this condition holds, P defines a map $\xi \to P(\xi)$ of S^{n-1} into $GL(N, C)$, where S^{n-1} is the unit sphere in $\Re^n$. This is why the homotopy (and hence the homology) of $GL(N, C)$ enters into the study of elliptic operators. Now, according to

the Bott periodicity theorem (Bott 1959, Atiyah and Bott 1964), the homotopy groups $\pi_{n-1}(GL(N,C))$ are 0 for n odd, and isomorphic to the integers for n even, provided that $2N \geq n$ (see also section 3.6). Thus, if n is even and $2N \geq n$, P defines an integer which may be called its *degree*. Such a degree may be evaluated explicitly as an integral

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} \omega(P) \quad ,$$

where $\omega(P)$ is a differential expression in P generalizing the familiar formula $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S^1}\frac{dP}{P}$. The use of these invariants of a general elliptic operator D, jointly with the ordinary characteristic classes of M, can give an explicit formula for index(D), which is indeed similar to that occurring in the Riemann-Roch formula. As Atiyah (1966) put it, the deeper underlying reason is that, as far as the topology is concerned, the classical operators are just as complicated as the most general ones, so that the Riemann-Roch formula contains relevant information about the general case.

If one is interested in the actual proof of the index theorem (cf. section 3.1), one can say that, when M is a simple space like a sphere, Bott's theorem can be used to deform D into a standard operator, whose index may be computed directly. Moreover, if M is complicated, one can embed M in a sphere S, and construct an elliptic operator, say D', on S, such that

$$\text{index}(D) = \text{index}(D') \quad . \tag{2.5.3}$$

Thus, reduction to the previous case is possible. However, even if one starts with a "nice" operator on M (for example, if D results from a complex structure), it is not possible, in general, to get a nice operator D' on S. Thus, the consideration of operators which are neither "nice" nor classical is indeed unavoidable. The topology of linear groups and the analysis of elliptic operators share important properties like linearity, stability under deformation, and finiteness. It was suggested in Atiyah 1966 that all this lies at the very heart of the close relation between these branches of mathematics. In the following chapters, we shall also

study index problems for manifolds with boundary, and their deep link with general properties of complex powers of elliptic operators, and the asymptotic expansion of the integrated heat-kernel (cf. Piazza 1991, Piazza 1993).

CHAPTER THREE

INDEX PROBLEMS

Abstract. This chapter begins with an outline of index problems for closed manifolds and for manifolds with boundary, and of the relation between index theory and anomalies in quantum field theory. In particular, the index of the Dirac operator is evaluated in the presence of gauge fields and gravitational fields. The result is expressed by integrating the Chern character and the Dirac genus. Interestingly, anomaly calculations turn out to be equivalent to the analysis of partition functions in ordinary quantum mechanics. The chapter ends with an introductory presentation of Bott periodicity and K-theory, with the aim of describing why the Dirac operator is the most fundamental, in the theory of elliptic operators on compact Riemannian manifolds.

3.1 Index Problem for Manifolds with Boundary

Following Atiyah and Bott 1965, this section is devoted to some aspects of the extension of the index formula for closed manifolds, to manifolds with boundary. The naturally occurring question is then how to measure the topological implications of elliptic boundary conditions, since boundary conditions have of course a definite effect on the index.

For example, let X be the unit disk in the plane, let Y be the boundary of X, and let b be a nowhere-vanishing vector field on Y. Denoting by D the Laplacian on X, we consider the operator

$$(D, b) : C^\infty(X) \to C^\infty(X) \oplus C^\infty(Y) \quad . \tag{3.1.1}$$

By definition, (D, b) sends f into $Df \oplus (bf \mid Y)$, where bf is the directional derivative of f along b. Since D is elliptic and b is non-vanishing, kernel and cokernel of (D, b) are both finite-dimensional, hence the index of the boundary-value problem is finite. One would now like it to express the index in terms of the topological data given by D and the boundary conditions. The solution of this problem is expressed by a formula derived by Vekua (Hörmander 1963), according to which

$$\text{index } (D, b) = 2\Big(1 - \text{winding number of } b\Big) \quad . \tag{3.1.2}$$

It is now necessary to recall the index formula for closed manifolds, and this is here done in the case of vector bundles. From now on, X is the base manifold, Y its boundary, $T(X)$ the tangent bundle of X, $B = B(X)$ the ball-bundle (consisting of vectors in $T(X)$ of length ≤ 1), $S = S(X)$ the sphere-bundle of unit vectors in $T(X)$. Of course, if X is a closed manifold (hence without boundary), then $S(X)$ is just the boundary of $B(X)$, i.e.

$$\partial B(X) = S(X) \quad \text{if } \partial X = \emptyset \quad . \tag{3.1.3}$$

However, if X has a boundary Y, then

$$\partial B(X) = S(X) \cup B(X) \mid Y \quad , \tag{3.1.4}$$

where $B(X) \mid Y$ is the subspace of $B(X)$ lying over Y under the natural map $\pi : B(X) \to X$.

We now focus on a system of k linear partial differential operators, i.e.

$$Df_i \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{ij} f_j \quad , \tag{3.1.5}$$

defined on the n-dimensional manifold X. As we know from section 2.3, the symbol of D is a function $\sigma(D)$ on $T^*(X)$ attaching to each cotangent vector λ of X, the matrix $\sigma(D : \lambda)$ obtained from the highest terms of A_{ij} by replacing $\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial x^\alpha}$ with $(i\lambda)^\alpha$. Moreover, the system D is *elliptic* if and only if the function $\sigma(D)$ maps $S(X)$ into the group $GL(k, C)$ of non-singular $k \times k$ matrices with complex coefficients. Thus, defining

$$GL \equiv \lim_{m \to \infty} GL(m, C) \quad , \tag{3.1.6}$$

the symbol defines a map (cf. appendix 3.A)

$$\sigma(D) : S(X) \to GL \quad . \tag{3.1.7}$$

Since the index of an elliptic system is invariant under deformations, on a closed manifold the index of D only depends on the homotopy class of the map $\sigma(D)$.

To write down the index formula we are looking for, one constructs a definite differential form $ch \equiv \sum_i ch^i$ on GL. Note that, strictly, we define a differential form $ch(m)$ on each $GL(m, C)$ (see Eqs. (3.B.12) and (3.B.13) for the Chern character). Moreover, by using a universal expression in the curvature of X, one constructs the Todd class of TX, denoted by $td(X)$, as in (3.B.16). The index theorem for a closed manifold then yields the index of D as an integral

$$\text{index}(D) = \int_{S(X)} \sigma(D)^* \; ch \wedge \pi^* td(X) \quad . \tag{3.1.8}$$

With our notation, $\sigma(D)^* ch$ is the form on GL pulled back to $S(X)$ via $\sigma(D)$. By virtue of (3.1.3), the integral (3.1.8) may be re-written as

$$\text{index}(D) = \int_{\partial B(X)} \sigma(D)^*\, ch \wedge \pi^* td(X) \quad . \tag{3.1.9}$$

In this form the index formula is also meaningful for a manifold with boundary, *provided that* $\sigma(D)$, originally defined on $S(X)$, is *extended* to $\partial B(X)$. It is indeed in this extension that the topological data of a set of elliptic boundary conditions manifest themselves. Following Atiyah and Bott 1965, we may in fact state the following theorem (cf. Booss and Bleecker 1985):

Theorem 3.1.1 A set of elliptic boundary conditions, B, on the elliptic system D, defines a definite map $\sigma(D, B) : \partial B(X) \to GL$, which extends the map $\sigma(D) : S(X) \to GL$ to the whole of $\partial B(X)$.

One thus finds an index theorem formally analogous to the original one, in that the index of D subject to the elliptic boundary condition B is given by

$$\text{index}(D, B) = \int_{\partial B(X)} \sigma(D, B)^* ch \wedge \pi^* td(X) \quad . \tag{3.1.10}$$

One can thus appreciate a key feature of index theorems: they relate analytic properties of differential operators on fibre bundles to the topological invariants of such bundles (i.e. their characteristic classes). As will be shown in the following sections, the relevance of index theorems for theoretical physics lies in the possibility to evaluate the number of zero-modes of differential operators, if one knows the topology of the fibre bundles under consideration.

3.2 Elliptic Boundary Conditions

Although this section is (a bit) technical, it is necessary to include it for the sake of completeness. Relevant examples of elliptic boundary-value problems (see appendix 3.A) will be given in chapters 5–10.

Following Atiyah and Bott 1965, let D be a $k \times k$ elliptic system of differential operators on X, and let r denote the order of D. The symbol $\sigma(D)$ is a function on the cotangent vector bundle $T^*(X)$ whose values are $(k \times k)$-matrices, and its restriction to the unit sphere-bundle $S(X)$ takes non-singular values. For our purposes, it is now necessary to consider a system B of boundary operators (cf. (5.1.18)) given by an $l \times k$ matrix with rows $b_1, ..., b_l$ of orders $r_1, ..., r_l$ respectively. We now denote by $\sigma(b_i)$ the symbol of b_i, and by $\sigma(B)$ the matrix with $\sigma(b_i)$ as i-th row. At a point of the boundary Y of X, let ν be the unit inward-pointing normal and let y denote any unit tangent vector to Y. One puts

$$\sigma_y(D)(t) = \sigma(D)(y + t\nu) \quad , \tag{3.2.1}$$

$$\sigma_y(B)(t) = \sigma(B)(y + t\nu) \quad , \tag{3.2.2}$$

so that $\sigma_y(D)$ and $\sigma_y(B)$ are polynomials in t. It then makes sense to consider the system of ordinary linear equations

$$\sigma_y(D)\left(-i\frac{d}{dt}\right)u = 0 \quad , \tag{3.2.3}$$

whose space of solutions is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_y$. The *ellipticity* of the system D means, by definition, that $\mathcal{M}_y$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{M}_y = \mathcal{M}_y^+ \oplus \mathcal{M}_y^- \quad , \tag{3.2.4}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_y^+$ consists only of exponential polynomials involving $e^{i\lambda t}$ with $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda) > 0$, and $\mathcal{M}_y^-$ involves those with $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda) < 0$. The ellipticity condition for the system of boundary operators, relative to the elliptic system of differential operators, is that the equations (3.2.3) should have a *unique* solution $u \in \mathcal{M}_y^+$ satisfying the boundary condition (cf. appendix 3.A)

$$\sigma_y(B)\left(-i\frac{d}{dt}\right)u\,|_{t=0} = V \quad , \tag{3.2.5}$$

for any given $V \in \mathcal{C}^l$.

Now a lemma can be proved, according to which a natural isomorphism of vector spaces exists between M_y^+, the cokernel of $\sigma_y(D)(t)$, and $\mathcal{M}_y^+$:

$$M_y^+ \cong \mathcal{M}_y^+ \quad . \tag{3.2.6}$$

Hence the elliptic boundary condition yields an isomorphism

$$\beta_y^+ : M_y^+ \to \mathcal{C}^l \quad . \tag{3.2.7}$$

The set of all M_y^+, for $y \in S(Y)$, forms a vector bundle M^+ over $S(Y)$, and (3.2.7) defines an isomorphism β^+ of M^+ with the trivial bundle $S(Y) \times \mathcal{C}^l$.

Possible boundary conditions are differential or integro-differential. If only differential boundary conditions are imposed then the map β_y^+, regarded as a function of y, cannot be an arbitrary continuous function. To obtain *all* continuous functions one has to enlarge the problem and consider integro-differential boundary conditions as well. This is, indeed, an important topological simplification. Thus, an elliptic problem (D, B) has associated with it $\sigma(D), M^+, \beta^+$, where β^+ can be any vector-bundle isomorphism of M^+ with the trivial bundle.

3.3 Index Theorems and Gauge Fields

Anomalies in gauge theories, and their relation to the index theory of the Dirac operator, are a key topic in the quantization of gauge theories of fundamental interactions. The aim of this section is to introduce the reader to ideas and problems in this field of research, following Atiyah 1984 and then Alvarez-Gaumé 1983b.

The index theorem is concerned with any elliptic differential operator, but for physical applications one only needs the special case of the Dirac operator. From chapter 1, we know that this is globally defined on any Riemannian manifold (M, g) provided that M is oriented and has a spin-structure. If M is compact,

the Dirac operator is elliptic, self-adjoint, and has a discrete spectrum of eigenvalues. Of particular interest is the 0-eigenspace (or null-space). By definition, the Dirac operator acts on spinor fields, and it should be emphasized that there is a basic algebraic difference between spinors in even and odd dimensions. In fact in odd dimensions spinors belong to an irreducible representation of the spin-group, whereas in even dimensions spinors break up into two irreducible pieces, here denoted by S^+ and S^-. The Dirac operator interchanges these two, hence it consists essentially of an operator (cf. section 1.4)

$$D : S^+ \to S^- \quad , \tag{3.3.1}$$

and its adjoint

$$D^* : S^- \to S^+ \quad . \tag{3.3.2}$$

The dimensions of the null-spaces of D and D^* are denoted by N^+ and N^- respectively, and the index of D (cf. Eqs. (2.3.3)–(2.3.5)) is defined by

$$\text{index}(D) \equiv N^+ - N^- \quad . \tag{3.3.3}$$

Note that, although a formal symmetry exists between positive and negative spinors (in fact they are interchanged by reversing the orientation of M), the numbers N^+ and N^- need not be equal, due to topological effects. Hence the origin of the *chiral anomaly* (cf. Rennie 1990).

The index theorem provides an explicit formula for index(D) in terms of topological invariants of M. Moreover, by using the Riemannian metric g and its curvature tensor $R(g)$, one can write an explicit integral formula

$$\text{index}(D) = \int_M \Omega(R(g)) \quad , \tag{3.3.4}$$

where Ω is a formal expression obtained purely algebraically from $R(g)$. For example, when M is four-dimensional one finds

$$\Omega = \frac{\text{Tr}\ \omega^2}{96\pi^2} \quad , \tag{3.3.5}$$

where ω is regarded as a matrix of two-forms. Interestingly, the index formula (3.3.4) is, from the physical point of view, purely gravitational since it only involves the metric g. Moreover, the index vanishes for the sphere or torus, and one needs more complicated manifolds to exhibit a non-vanishing index. However, (3.3.4) can be generalized to gauge theories. This means that one is given a complex vector bundle V over M with a unitary connection A. If the fibre of V is isomorphic with $\mathcal{C}^N$, then A is a $U(N)$ gauge field over M. The *extended Dirac operator* now acts on vector-bundle-valued spinors

$$D_A : S^+ \otimes V \to S^- \otimes V \quad , \tag{3.3.6}$$

and one defines again the index of D_A by a formula like (3.3.3). The index formula (3.3.4) is then replaced by

$$\text{index}\Big(D_A\Big) = \int_M \Omega(R(g), F(A)) \quad , \tag{3.3.7}$$

where $F(A)$ is the curvature of A, and $\Omega(R, F)$ is a certain algebraic expression in R and F. For example, if M is four-dimensional, (3.3.5) is generalized by

$$\Omega = \frac{\text{Tr}\ \omega^2}{96\pi^2} - \frac{\text{Tr}\ F^2}{8\pi^2} \quad . \tag{3.3.8}$$

We now find it instructive, instead of giving a brief outline of a wide range of results (see, for example, Rennie 1990 and Gilkey 1995), to focus on a specific but highly non-trivial example. Following Alvarez-Gaumé 1983b, we deal (again) with the Dirac equation in the presence of external gauge and gravitational fields. The motivations of our investigation lie in the deep link between supersymmetry and the Atiyah-Singer index theorem. Indeed, if one considers supersymmetric quantum mechanics, which may be viewed as a (0+1)-dimensional field theory, one finds that this theory has N conserved charges, say Q_i, which anticommute with the fermion number operator $(-1)^F$, and which satisfy the supersymmetry algebra (for all $i, j = 1, ..., N$):

$$\left\{Q_i, Q_j^*\right\} = 2\delta_{ij} H \quad , \tag{3.3.9}$$

$$\left\{Q_i, (-1)^F\right\} = 0 \quad , \tag{3.3.10}$$

$$\{Q_i, Q_j\} = 0 \quad , \tag{3.3.11}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian of supersymmetric quantum mechanics. If Q, Q^* are any of the N supersymmetric charges, the operator

$$S \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(Q + Q^*) \tag{3.3.12}$$

is Hermitian and satisfies $S^2 = H$. Moreover, if $\mid E\rangle$ is an arbitrary eigenstate of H:

$$H \mid E\rangle = E \mid E\rangle \quad , \tag{3.3.13}$$

then $S \mid E\rangle$ is another state with the same energy. Thus, if $\mid E\rangle$ is a bosonic state, $S \mid E\rangle$ is fermionic, and the other way around, and non-zero energy states in the spectrum appear in Fermi-Bose pairs. This in turn implies that $\mathrm{Tr}(-1)^F e^{-\beta H}$ receives contributions only from zero-energy states. Further to this, the work in Witten 1982 has shown that $\mathrm{Tr}(-1)^F e^{-\beta H}$ is a *topological invariant* of the quantum theory. Bearing in mind that bosonic zero-energy states, say $\mid B\rangle$, are, by definition, solutions of the equation

$$Q \mid B\rangle = 0 \quad , \tag{3.3.14}$$

and fermionic zero-modes solve instead the equation

$$Q^* \mid F\rangle = 0 \quad , \tag{3.3.15}$$

one finds that

$$\mathrm{Index}(Q) = \dim \mathrm{Ker}\, Q - \dim \mathrm{Ker}\, Q^* = \mathrm{Tr}\left[(-1)^F e^{-\beta H}\right] \quad . \tag{3.3.16}$$

The problem of finding the index of Q is therefore reduced to the evaluation of the trace on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.3.16) in the $\beta \to 0$ limit. The idea of

Alvarez-Gaumé (1983a–b) was to perform this calculation with the help of a path-integral representation of the partition function, with periodic boundary conditions for fermionic fields:

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[(-1)^F e^{-\beta H}\right] = \int_{\Omega_\beta} d\phi(t)\; d\psi(t)\; \exp - \int_0^\beta L_E(t) dt \quad , \tag{3.3.17}$$

where ϕ and ψ are required to belong to the class Ω_β of fermionic fields, say χ, such that

$$\chi(0) = \chi(\beta) \quad . \tag{3.3.18}$$

The next non-trivial step is to use the Lagrangian of the supersymmetric non-linear σ-model obtained by dimensional reduction from $1+1$ to $0+1$ dimensions:

$$\begin{aligned} L = & \frac{1}{2} g_{ij}(\phi) \dot{\phi}^i \dot{\phi}^j + \frac{i}{2} g_{jk} \psi^j_\alpha \left[\frac{d}{dt} \psi^k_\alpha + \Gamma^k_{\ ml}\; \dot{\phi}^m\; \psi^l_\alpha \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{4} R_{ijkl}\; \psi^i_1\; \psi^j_1\; \psi^k_2\; \psi^l_2 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{3.3.19}$$

With this notation, g_{ij} is the metric on the manifold M, $\Gamma^i_{\ jk}$ are the Christoffel symbols, $R^i_{\ jkl}$ is the Riemann tensor of M, $\psi^i_\alpha(t)$ are real anticommuting fermionic fields ($\alpha = 1, 2$).

Since our ultimate goal is the analysis of the Dirac equation in the presence of gauge fields, it is now appropriate to consider a gauge group, say G, acting on M, with gauge connection $A^\alpha_i(\phi)$ and gauge curvature

$$F^\alpha_{ij}(\phi) = \partial_i A^\alpha_j - \partial_j A^\alpha_i + h f^\alpha_{\ \beta\gamma}\; A^\beta_i\; A^\gamma_j \quad , \tag{3.3.20}$$

where h is the gauge coupling constant and Greek indices range from 1 through $\dim(G)$. In the explicit expression of the first-order derivative resulting from the Dirac operator, one has now to include both the effects of A^α_i and the contribution of the spin-connection, say ω^a_{ib}. In terms of the vierbein e^a_i (cf. section 1.2), and of its dual E^i_a:

$$E^i_{\ a}\; e^a_{\ j} = \delta^i_{\ j} \quad , \tag{3.3.21}$$

one has

$$\omega^a_{ib} = -E^k_b\Big(\partial_i e^a_{\ k} - \Gamma^l_{\ ik}\ e^a_{\ l}\Big) \quad , \tag{3.3.22}$$

and the eigenvalue problem for the Dirac operator reads

$$i\gamma^k\Big(\partial_k + \frac{1}{2}\omega_{kab}\sigma^{ab} + ihA^\alpha_k T^\alpha\Big)_{AB}\Big(\psi_\lambda\Big)_B = \lambda\Big(\psi_\lambda\Big)_A \quad . \tag{3.3.23}$$

In Eq. (3.3.23), one has (cf. (1.2.10)) $\sigma^{ab} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\Big[\gamma^a, \gamma^b\Big]$, and $\Big(T^\alpha\Big)_{AB}$ are the generators of the representation of G, with indices A, B ranging from 1 through $\dim(T)$. The reader should be aware that our a, b indices, here used to follow the notation in Alvarez-Gaumé 1983b, correspond to the hatted indices of section 1.2.

We are eventually interested in the one-dimensional analogue of Eq. (3.3.23). For this purpose, we consider a pair of fermionic annihilation and creation operators, say C_A, C^*_A:

$$\{C_A, C_B\} = \{C^*_A, C^*_B\} = 0 \quad , \tag{3.3.24}$$

$$\{C^*_A, C_B\} = \delta_{AB} \quad . \tag{3.3.25}$$

They lead to the eigenvalue equation

$$i\gamma^k\Big(\partial_k + \frac{1}{2}\omega_{kab}\sigma^{ab} + ihA^\alpha_k C^* T C\Big) \mid \psi\rangle = \lambda \mid \psi\rangle \quad . \tag{3.3.26}$$

Interestingly, if $\mid \psi, \lambda\rangle$ is an eigenfunction of the Dirac operator with eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0$, then $\gamma_5 \mid \psi, \lambda\rangle$ turns out to be the eigenfunction belonging to the eigenvalue $-\lambda$. Thus, since (hereafter, $\mathcal{D} \equiv i\gamma^k D_k$) $\Big[\mathcal{D}^2, \gamma_5\Big] = 0$, one finds (see (3.3.16))

$$\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\gamma_5 e^{-\beta\mathcal{D}^2}\Big] = n_{E=0}(\gamma_5 = 1) - n_{E=0}(\gamma_5 = -1) \quad , \tag{3.3.27}$$

where $n_{E=0}(\gamma_5 = 1)$ and $n_{E=0}(\gamma_5 = -1)$ denote the number of zero-eigenvalues of $\mathcal{D}$ with $\gamma_5 = 1$ and $\gamma_5 = -1$, respectively. On writing this equation, we have recognized that $(-1)^F = \gamma_5$ in four dimensions. Now the Euclidean Lagrangian is inserted into the path-integral formula (3.3.17), with the understanding that functional integration is restricted to the space of one-particle states for the (C, C^*)

fermions. This restriction is indeed necessary to ensure that the index of $\mathcal{D}$ is evaluated only in the representation T^α of the gauge group G. The boundary conditions are now (3.3.18) for ϕ and ψ, jointly with antiperiodic boundary conditions for fermionic operators:

$$C(0) = -C(\beta) \quad , \quad C^*(0) = -C^*(\beta) \quad . \tag{3.3.28}$$

Moreover, the background-field method is used, writing (recall that $\psi^a \equiv e^a_{\ i}\ \psi^i$)

$$\phi^i = \phi^i_0 + \xi^i \quad , \quad \psi^a = \psi^a_0 + \eta^a \quad . \tag{3.3.29}$$

The underlying idea is that, in the $\beta \to 0$ limit, the functional integral is dominated by time-independent field configurations ϕ^i_0 and ψ^a_0. The terms ξ^i and η^a are then the fluctuations around the constant background values, according to (3.3.29). Omitting a few details, which can be found in Alvarez-Gaumé 1983b and references therein, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{index}(\mathcal{D}) = (i/2\pi)^n \int \mathrm{dvol} \int d\psi_0 \left(\mathrm{Tr} \exp\Big(-\frac{i}{2} \psi^a_0 \psi^b_0 F^\alpha_{ab} T^\alpha \Big) \right) \\ \times \prod_{l=1}^{n} \frac{(ix_l/2)}{\sinh(ix_l/2)} \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.3.30}$$

where $(2\pi)^{-n}$ results from the Feynman measure for constant modes, $(i)^n$ is due to integration over constant real-valued fermionic configurations, and the x_l are the eigenvalues of the matrix $\frac{1}{2} R_{abcd}\ \psi^c_0\ \psi^d_0$. Note that, considering the Riemann curvature two-form

$$R_{ab} \equiv \frac{1}{2} R_{abcd}\ e^c \wedge e^d \quad , \tag{3.3.31}$$

and the gauge curvature two-form

$$F \equiv \frac{h}{2} F^\alpha_{ab}\ T^\alpha\ e^a \wedge e^b \quad , \tag{3.3.32}$$

one can form the polynomials (cf. appendix 3.B)

$$ch(F) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\ e^{F/2\pi} \quad , \tag{3.3.33}$$

$$\widehat{A}(M) \equiv \prod_{\alpha} \frac{(\omega_\alpha/4\pi)}{\sinh(\omega_\alpha/4\pi)} \quad . \tag{3.3.34}$$

In the definition (3.3.33), the trace is taken over the representation T^α of G, and in (3.3.34) the ω_α are the eigenvalues of the antisymmetric matrix (3.3.31). According to a standard notation, $ch(F)$ is the Chern character of the principal bundle associated to the gauge field, and $\widehat{A}(M)$ is the Dirac genus of M. They make it possible to re-express the result (3.3.30) in the neat form (cf. (3.1.8))

$$\text{index}(\mathcal{D}) = \int_M ch(F)\widehat{A}(M) \quad . \tag{3.3.35}$$

In particular, if M is four-dimensional, Eq. (3.3.35) leads to (cf. (3.3.7))

$$\text{index}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{(\dim T)}{192\pi^2} \int \text{Tr} R \wedge R + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int \text{Tr} F \wedge F \quad . \tag{3.3.36}$$

As Alvarez-Gaumé (1983b) pointed out, this calculation has great relevance for the theory of anomalies in quantum field theory. Indeed, anomaly calculations involve usually traces of the form $\sum_n \psi_n^\dagger(x)\, L\, \psi_n(x)$, where L is a differential or algebraic operator, and the $\psi_n' s$ are eigenfunctions of the Dirac operator in the presence of external fields (either gravitational or gauge fields). The analysis leading to (3.3.36) has shown that such traces can be turned into functional integrals for one-dimensional field theories. In other words, anomaly calculations are equivalent to the analysis of partition functions in quantum mechanics (Alvarez-Gaumé 1983b).

Indeed, another definition of index is also available in the literature. This is motivated by the analysis of a family D of elliptic operators D_x, parametrized by the points x of a compact space, say X. The corresponding index is then defined by (Rennie 1990)

$$\text{index}(D) \equiv \text{Ker}(D) - \text{Coker}(D) \quad , \tag{3.3.37}$$

where $\text{Ker}(D)$ denotes the *family* of vector spaces $\text{Ker}(D_x)$, and similarly for $\text{Coker}(D)$. The index defined in (3.3.37) turns out to be an element of the K-theory of X (see section 3.7). An outstanding open problem is to prove that the

supersymmetric functional integral admits a K-theoretic interpretation. Moreover, it remains to be seen whether supersymmetry can be applied to prove the index theorem for families (cf. Atiyah and Singer 1971a). The author is indebted to Professor L. Alvarez-Gaumé for correspondence about these issues.

3.4 Index of Two-Parameter Families

A very important property of the index is that it is unchanged by perturbation of the operator, hence it can be given by a topological formula. This is why, when we vary the gauge field A continuously, the index of the extended Dirac operator D_A does not change. It is however possible to extract more topological information from a continuous family of operators, and we here focus on the two-parameter case (Atiyah 1984).

For this purpose we consider a two-dimensional surface X compact, connected and oriented, and suppose a fibre bundle Y over X is given with fibre M. The twist involved in making a non-trivial bundle is an essential topological feature. By giving Y a Riemannian metric, one gets metrics g_x on all fibres M_x, hence one has metrics on M parametrized by X. The corresponding family of Dirac operators on M is denoted by D_x. We can now define two topological invariants, i.e. index(D_x) and the *degree* of the family of Dirac operators. To define such a degree, we restrict ourselves to the particular case when the index vanishes.

Since index$(D_x) = 0$ by hypothesis, the generic situation (one can achieve this by perturbing the metric on Y) is that D_x is invertible $\forall x \in X$ except at a finite number of points $x_1, ..., x_k$. Moreover, a multiplicity ν_i can be assigned to each x_i, which is generically ± 1. To obtain this one can, in the neighbourhood of each x_i, replace D_x by a finite matrix T_x. Zeros of $\det(T_x)$ have multiplicity ν_i at x_i. We are actually dealing with the phase-variation of $\det(T_x)$ as x traverses positively a small circle centred at x_i.

The degree ν of the family of Dirac operators D_x is defined by

$$\nu \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{k} \nu_i \quad . \tag{3.4.1}$$

This is a topological invariant of the family in that it is invariant under perturbation. Hence it only depends on the topology of the fibre bundle Y and vanishes for the product $M \times X$. In the case of gauge fields, one can fix the metric g on X and take $Y = M \times X$, but we also take a vector bundle V on Y with a connection. This gives a family A_x of gauge fields, and the corresponding Dirac family has again a degree which now depends on the topology of V. Such a degree vanishes if the vector bundle V comes from a bundle on M.

3.5 Determinants of Dirac Operators

For fermionic fields one has to define determinants of Dirac operators, and these are not positive-definite by virtue of their first-order nature. Consider as before an even-dimensional Riemannian manifold (M, g) with Dirac operators $D_g : S^+ \to S^-$, depending on the metric g. We look for a regularized complex-valued determinant $\det(D_g)$ which should have the following properties (Atiyah 1984):

(1) $\det(D_g)$ is a differentiable function of g.

(2) $\det(D_g)$ is gauge-invariant, i.e. $\det\Big(D_{f_{(g)}}\Big) = \det(D_g)$ for any diffeomorphism f of M.

(3) $\det(D_g) = 0$ to first-order if and only if $D_g^* \; D_g$ has exactly one zero-eigenvalue.

The third property is the characteristic property of determinants in finite dimensions and it is a minimum requirement for any regularized determinant. Note also that, since $D_g^* \; D_g$ is a Laplace-type operator, there is no difficulty in defining its

determinant, so that one can also define $|\det(D_g)|$. The problem is to define the *phase* of $\det(D_g)$ (cf. section 6 of Martellini and Reina 1985).

Suppose now that one can find a fibration over a surface X with fibre M, so that the Dirac operators D_x all have vanishing index whereas the *degree* of the family does not vanish. This implies that there is no function $\det(D_g)$ with the 3 properties just listed. Suppose in fact that such a $\det(D_g)$ exists. Then (1) and (2) imply that $h(x) \equiv \det\Big(D_{g_x}\Big)$ is a differentiable complex-valued function on X. Moreover, (3) implies that ν is the number of zeros of h counted with multiplicities and signs, i.e. that ν is the degree of $h : X \to \mathcal{C}$. But topological arguments may be used to show that the degree of h has to vanish, hence $\nu = 0$, contradicting the assumption.

We should now bear in mind that the local multiplicities ν_i at points x_i where D_x is not invertible, are defined as local phase variations obtained by using an eigenvalue cut-off. Remarkably, if it were possible to use such a cut-off consistently at all points, the total phase variation ν would have to vanish. Thus, a fibration with non-vanishing degree implies a behaviour of the eigenvalues which prevents a good cut-off regularization. Such a remark is not of purely academic interest, since two-dimensional examples can be found, involving surfaces M and X of fairly high genus, where all these things happen. What is essentially involved is the variation in the conformal structure of M (cf. section 5.3).

Other examples of non-vanishing degree, relevant for gauge theory, are obtained when M is the $2n$-sphere S^{2n}, $X = S^2$ and the vector bundle V is $(n+1)$-dimensional, so that the gauge group G is $U(n+1)$ or $SU(n+1)$. If one represents S^2 as $\Re^2 \cup \infty$ then, removing the point at infinity, one obtains a two-parameter family of gauge fields on M parametrized by $\Re^2$. Since this family is defined by a bundle over $M \times S^2$, gauge fields are all gauge-equivalent as one goes to ∞ in $\Re^2$. What are we really up to ? By taking a large circle in $\Re^2$, one gets a closed path in the group $\mathcal{G}$ of gauge transformations of the bundle on M. The degree ν is essentially a homomorphism $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}) \to Z$, and if ν does not vanish, the variation in

phase of $\det(D_g)$ going round this path in $\mathcal{G}$ proves the lack of gauge-invariance. If $M = S^{2n}$ one has

$$\pi_1(\mathcal{G}) = \pi_{2n+1}(G) \quad , \tag{3.5.1}$$

$$\pi_{2n+1}\Big(SU(n+1)\Big) = Z \quad , \tag{3.5.2}$$

and the isomorphism is given by ν, by virtue of the general index theorem for families (Atiyah and Singer 1971a).

3.6 Bott Periodicity

A crucial and naturally occurring problem in all our investigations is why the Dirac operator is so important in index theory. The answer is provided by the so-called Bott periodicity theorem. To understand the key features, let us consider an elliptic operator on $\Re^n$ with constant coefficients, say P, which acts on $\mathcal{C}^m$-valued functions. The symbol of P, denoted by $\sigma_P(\xi)$, provides a map

$$\sigma_P : S^{n-1} \to GL(m, \mathcal{C}) \quad .$$

For example, the restricted Dirac operator on $\Re^{2k}$, say B, yields the map

$$\sigma_B : S^{2k-1} \to GL(2^{k-1}, \mathcal{C}) \quad .$$

The Bott periodicity theorem states that this is a stable generator, in that

(i) The map

$$\pi_i(GL(m, \mathcal{C})) \to \pi_i(GL(m+1, \mathcal{C}))$$

is an isomorphism for $m > \frac{i}{2}$;

(ii) The limit group $\pi_i(GL(\infty))$ is 0 if i is even, and coincides with Z, generated by σ_B, if i is odd.

We now find it helpful to state the Bott theorem in an even simpler form. In other words, one studies the homotopy groups of certain Lie groups, and one finds that they are periodic, in that (Rennie 1990)

$$\pi_n(U(N)) = 0 \text{ if } n \text{ is even and } n < 2N \quad , \tag{3.6.1}$$

$$\pi_n(U(N)) = Z \text{ if } n \text{ is odd and } n > 2N \quad . \tag{3.6.2}$$

Moreover, in terms of the $N \to \infty$ limit, one has the periodicity

$$\pi_n(U(\infty)) = \pi_{n+2}(U(\infty)) \quad , \tag{3.6.3}$$

$$\pi_n(O(\infty)) = \pi_{n+8}(O(\infty)) \quad . \tag{3.6.4}$$

A global version of the Bott theorem, resulting from the local form, is also available. According to the global Bott theorem, the symbol of the Dirac operator on a compact manifold is a generator, in a suitable sense, of all elliptic symbols. More precisely, let X be a compact, oriented, $2k$-dimensional manifold endowed with a spin-structure (see section 1.3). We know from section 2.3 that an elliptic differential operator

$$P : C^\infty(X, V) \to C^\infty(X, W)$$

has a symbol, say σ_P, which is an isomorphism

$$\pi^* V \to \pi^* W \quad ,$$

where $\pi : S(X) \to X$ is the projection map of the unit sphere-bundle. A *trivial symbol* is a symbol for which $V = W$ and σ is the identity map. Two symbols are said to be *equivalent* if they become homotopic after adding trivial symbols.

The global Bott theorem can be then stated by saying that every symbol is equivalent to the symbol of B_V, for some V, where B_V is the restricted Dirac operator, extended so as to act on the tensor product $E^+ \otimes V$. For index problems, the interest of this property lies in the fact that two elliptic operators whose symbols are equivalent turn out to have the same index. Thus, if one is able to

find the index of B_V for all V, one can indeed obtain an index formula for all elliptic operators on X.

3.7 K-Theory

The global Bott theorem and the global theory of the Dirac operator find their natural formulation within the framework of K-theory. The formalism is as abstract as powerful, and some key steps are as follows (Atiyah 1967).

We are interested in complex vector bundles over a compact manifold X. The set $Vect(X)$ of isomorphism classes of vector bundles over X has the structure of an Abelian semi-group (the same holds if X is any space), where the additive structure is defined by direct sum. If A is *any* Abelian semi-group (recall that a semi-group is a set of elements $\{a, b, c, ...\}$ with a binary operation of product, say ab, such that $(ab)c = a(bc)$), one can associate to A an Abelian group, $K(A)$, with the following property: there is a semi-group homomorphism:

$$\alpha : A \to K(A) \tag{3.7.1}$$

such that, if G is *any* group, and if

$$\gamma : A \to G \tag{3.7.2}$$

is *any* semi-group homomorphism, there is a *unique* homomorphism

$$\kappa : K(A) \to G \tag{3.7.3}$$

such that

$$\gamma = \kappa \, \alpha \quad . \tag{3.7.4}$$

If such a $K(A)$ exists, it must be unique. Note that the order of factors on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.7.4) is of the right sort: first, α maps A into $K(A)$, then κ maps $K(A)$ into G. Altogether, this is a map of A into G. What is non-trivial is the uniqueness property of the homomorphism.

To define the group $K(A)$, one starts from $F(A)$, the free Abelian group generated by the elements of A. Second, one considers $E(A)$, the subgroup of $F(A)$ generated by those elements of the form

$$a + a' - (a \oplus a') \quad ,$$

where $\oplus$ is the addition in A, and $a, a' \in A$. Then

$$K(A) \equiv F(A)/E(A) \tag{3.7.5}$$

is the desired Abelian group. If A possesses a multiplication which is distributive over the addition of A, then $K(A)$ is a ring.

Now if X is a space, one writes

$$K(X) \equiv K(Vect(X)) \tag{3.7.6}$$

for the ring $K(Vect(X))$. Moreover, if $E \in Vect(X)$, one writes $[E]$ for the image of E in $K(X)$. One can prove that every element of $K(X)$ is of the form $[E]-[F]$, where E, F are bundles over X. Let now T be a bundle such that $F \oplus T$ is trivial. On writing $\underline{n}$ for the trivial bundle of dimension n, this means that

$$F \oplus T = \underline{n} \quad . \tag{3.7.7}$$

One can thus obtain a very useful formula for a generic element of $K(X)$:

$$[E] - [F] = [E] + [T] - ([F] + [T]) = [E \oplus T] - [\underline{n}] \quad . \tag{3.7.8}$$

In other words, every element of $K(X)$ is of the form $[H] - [\underline{n}]$. If two bundles become equivalent when a suitable trivial bundle is added to each of them, the bundles are said to be *stably equivalent*. Thus, $[E] = [F]$ if and only if E and F are stably equivalent

For a space with base point x_0, one defines

$$\widetilde{K}(X) \equiv \mathrm{Ker}\,\{K(X) \to K(x_0)\} \quad . \tag{3.7.9}$$

Since $K(\text{point}) \cong Z$, one has the isomorphism

$$K(X) \cong \widetilde{K}(X) \oplus Z \quad . \tag{3.7.10}$$

For a closed sub-space of X, say Y, one defines

$$K(X,Y) \equiv \widetilde{K}(X/Y) \quad , \tag{3.7.11}$$

where X/Y is obtained by collapsing Y to a point, taken as the base point. For a locally compact space, one sets

$$K(X) \equiv \widetilde{K}(X^+) \quad , \tag{3.7.12}$$

where X^+ is the one-point compactification of X. Another elementary lemma can then be proved:

If $Y \subset X$ is a compact pair, then

$$K(X,Y) \to K(X) \to K(Y)$$

is an exact sequence.

The tensor product of vector bundles induces a ring structure on $K(X)$, and $K(Y,X)$ becomes a module on $K(X)$. The identity map

$$S^1 \to U(1) \subset GL(1,\mathcal{C})$$

defines a line-bundle, say H, on $S^2 = \mathcal{C}^+$. Let $b \in K(\mathcal{C})$ be the class of $H - 1$. The local form of the Bott periodicity theorem is therefore (Atiyah 1975a):

Theorem 3.7.1 Multiplication by b provides an isomorphism

$$\beta : K(X) \to K(\mathcal{C} \times X) \quad .$$

On taking $X = \mathcal{C}^n$ and applying induction for $n \geq 0$, one finds that $K(\mathcal{C}^n) \cong Z$. Moreover, the symbol of the restricted Dirac operator, B, is eventually identified with the element b^n.

In the analysis of global properties, one first proves that an elliptic symbol σ defines an element $[\sigma]$ of $K(T^*X)$. The global Bott theorem is then:

Theorem 3.7.2 For an even-dimensional spin-manifold, multiplication by σ_B provides the isomorphism

$$K(X) \to K(T^*X) \quad .$$

In particular, if the manifold X is parallelizable, theorem 3.7.2 reduces to theorem 3.7.1. In the general case, one takes a covering of X, on which T^*X is trivial, and one applies induction by using the long exact sequence which extends

$$K(X,Y) \to K(X) \to K(Y) \quad .$$

This long exact sequence involves higher-order groups, denoted by $K^{-n}(X)$, defined, for $n \geq 0$, by means of

$$K^{-n}(X) \equiv K(\Re^n \times X) \quad . \tag{3.7.13}$$

One may wonder what can be said about manifolds which are not spin-manifolds. Indeed, if X is not a spin-manifold one cannot define a Dirac operator. One can, however, build a signature operator (see section 2.3), say A. Locally, the symbol of A is equivalent to a multiple of the symbol of B (Atiyah 1975a):

$$\sigma_A = 2^k \, \sigma_B \quad . \tag{3.7.14}$$

3.A Appendix

An elliptic boundary-value problem consists of the pair (P, B), where, for a given vector bundle V over a Riemannian manifold M, P is a differential operator of order d on V, and B is a boundary operator (see (5.1.18)). The *strong ellipticity* of (P, B) is defined in terms of the eigenvalue equation for the leading symbol of P, jointly with an asymptotic condition on the solution of this equation. For us to

be able to define these concepts, it is necessary to start from the structure which makes it possible to split the tangent bundle of M in the form of a direct sum (Gilkey 1995)

$$T(M) = T(\partial M) \oplus T([0, \delta)) \quad . \tag{3.A.1}$$

Indeed, following Gilkey 1995, one can use the inward geodesic flow to identify a neighbourhood of ∂M with the *collar*

$$\mathcal{C} : \partial M \times [0, i(M)) \quad , \tag{3.A.2}$$

$i(M)$ being the injectivity radius. If $(y_1, ..., y_{m-1})$ are local coordinates on the boundary, and if x_m is the geodesic distance to the boundary, a system of local coordinates on the collar is then $(y_1, ..., y_{m-1}, x_m)$. The normal derivatives $D_m^k\Big(f \mid_{\mathcal{C}}\Big)$ are well defined after identifying $V \mid_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $V \times [0, i(M))$. We now need to define d-graded vector bundles (d being the order of P) and their auxiliary bundles. For this purpose, following Gilkey 1995, we say that a d-graded vector bundle is a vector bundle, say U, endowed with a decomposition into d sub-bundles

$$U = U_0 \oplus ... \oplus U_{d-1} \quad . \tag{3.A.3}$$

Moreover, we consider W, defined by

$$W \equiv [V]_{\partial M} \oplus ... \oplus [V]_{\partial M} \quad , \tag{3.A.4}$$

i.e. the d-graded vector bundle for boundary data, and define (Gilkey 1995)

$$f_i \equiv \Big[D^i{}_m(f \mid_{\mathcal{C}})\Big]_{\partial M} \quad . \tag{3.A.5}$$

The boundary data map is then a map

$$\overline{\gamma} : C^\infty(V) \to C^\infty(W)$$

such that

$$\overline{\gamma}(f) \equiv (f_0, ..., f_{d-1}) \quad . \tag{3.A.6}$$

Further to this, one has to take into account an *auxiliary* d-graded vector bundle over the boundary, say Y, whose dimension satisfies

$$\dim(Y) = \frac{d}{2}\dim(V) \quad . \tag{3.A.7}$$

If $B : C^\infty(W) \to C^\infty(Y)$ is a tangential differential operator defined on ∂M, one can decompose it as follows:

$$B \equiv B_{ij} \quad , \tag{3.A.8a}$$

$$B_{ij} : C^\infty(W_i) \to C^\infty(Y_j) \quad , \tag{3.A.8b}$$

with $\mathrm{ord}(B_{ij}) \leq j - i$. Sections of $C^\infty(W_i)$ arise from taking the normal derivative of order i.

All these geometric objects make it possible to define the *d-graded leading symbol* of B as follows (Gilkey 1995):

$$\sigma_g(B)_{ij}(y,\zeta) \equiv \sigma_L(B_{ij})(y,\zeta) \ \text{ if } \ \mathrm{ord}(B_{ij}) = j - i \quad , \tag{3.A.9a}$$

$$\sigma_g(B)_{ij}(y,\zeta) \equiv 0 \ \text{ if } \ \mathrm{ord}(B_{ij}) < j - i \quad . \tag{3.A.9b}$$

With the notation described so far, the boundary condition is expressed by the equation

$$B \,\overline{\gamma}\, f = 0 \quad . \tag{3.A.10}$$

To define *strong ellipticity* of the pair (P, B) one assumes that P is a differential operator on V of order d, with elliptic leading symbol, say p_d. If $\mathcal{K}$ is a cone containing 0 and contained in $\mathbf{C}$, and such that, for $\xi \neq 0$,

$$\mathrm{Spec}(p_d(x,\xi)) \subset \mathcal{K}^c \quad , \tag{3.A.11}$$

one studies, on the boundary, the equation

$$p_d(y,0,\zeta,D_r)f(r) = \lambda\, f(r) \quad , \tag{3.A.12}$$

subject to the asymptotic condition

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} f(r) = 0 \quad , \tag{3.A.13}$$

and under the assumption that $(0,0) \neq (\zeta,\lambda) \in T^*(\partial M) \times \mathcal{K}$. By definition, the pair (P,B) is said to be *strongly elliptic* with respect to the cone $\mathcal{K}$ if, for any w belonging to the auxiliary d-graded vector bundle Y, there exists a *unique* solution of the problem described by Eqs. (3.A.12) and (3.A.13), with (Gilkey 1995)

$$\sigma_g(B)(y,\zeta)\overline{\gamma}(f) = w \quad . \tag{3.A.14}$$

The cone $\mathcal{K}$ is normally assumed to coincide with the set of complex numbers minus $\Re^+$ (or minus $\Re$ and $\Re^+$).

For example, if P is an operator of Laplace type on $C^\infty(V)$, one finds (Gilkey 1995)

$$p_d(y,0,\zeta,D_r)f(r) = -\partial_r^2 + \mid \zeta \mid^2 \quad , \tag{3.A.15}$$

and hence the solutions of Eq. (3.A.12) read

$$f(r) = w_0 e^{\mu r} + w_1 e^{-\mu r} \quad , \tag{3.A.16}$$

where $\mu \equiv \sqrt{\mid \zeta \mid^2 - \lambda}$. Bearing in mind that $\mathrm{Re}(\mu) > 0$, the asymptotic condition (3.A.13) picks out the solution of the form

$$\widetilde{f}(r) = w_1 e^{-\mu r} \quad . \tag{3.A.17}$$

These properties are useful in the course of proving that P is strongly elliptic with respect to the cone $\mathbf{C} - \Re^+$, when the boundary conditions are a mixture of Dirichlet and Robin conditions (see our Eq. (5.4.2) and Gilkey 1995). A thorough treatment of elliptic boundary-value problems, with emphasis on the analytic approach, may be found in Grubb 1996.

3.B Appendix

This appendix describes briefly some concepts in homotopy theory and in the theory of characteristic classes. It is intended to help the readers who have already

attended introductory courses, but do not have enough time to read comprehensive monographs or long review papers.

(i) A very important concept in homotopy theory is that of an exact sequence. A sequence of groups and homomorphisms

$$...\stackrel{f_{i-1}}{\longrightarrow}H_i\stackrel{f_i}{\longrightarrow}H_{i+1}\stackrel{f_{i+1}}{\longrightarrow}H_{i+2}...$$

is called an *exact sequence* if, for all i,

$$\text{Im } f_{i-1} = \text{Ker } f_i \quad . \tag{3.B.1}$$

A *short* exact sequence is a five-term sequence with trivial end groups, i.e.

$$0 \longrightarrow H\stackrel{f}{\longrightarrow}H'\stackrel{f'}{\longrightarrow}H'' \longrightarrow 0 \quad . \tag{3.B.2}$$

(ii) If m is a complex $k \times k$ matrix, and $Q(m)$ is a polynomial in the components of m, then $Q(m)$ is called a *characteristic polynomial* if

$$Q(m) = Q(h^{-1}\ m\ h) \quad \forall h \in GL(k, \mathcal{C}) \quad . \tag{3.B.3}$$

The polynomial $Q(m)$ is a symmetric function of the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k\}$ of m. The j-th symmetric polynomial, say $T_j(\lambda)$, reads

$$T_j(\lambda) = \sum_{i_1<i_2<...i_j} \lambda_{i_1}\ \lambda_{i_2}...\lambda_{i_j} \quad , \tag{3.B.4}$$

and $Q(m)$ is a polynomial in the $T_j(\lambda)$:

$$Q(m) = \alpha + \beta T_1(\lambda) + \gamma T_2(\lambda) + \delta[T_1(\lambda)]^2 + ... \quad . \tag{3.B.5}$$

If, in $Q(m)$, one replaces m by the curvature two-form Ω, one finds that $Q(\Omega)$ is closed.

The *total Chern form* $c(\Omega)$ of a complex vector bundle E over M, with $GL(k,\mathcal{C})$ transition functions and connection ω, is defined in terms of the characteristic polynomial $\det(I+m)$ for Ω:

$$c(\Omega) = \det\left(I + \frac{i}{2\pi}\Omega\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(\Omega) \quad , \tag{3.B.6}$$

where the various Chern forms in (3.B.6) read

$$c_0(\Omega) = 1 \quad , \tag{3.B.7}$$

$$c_1(\Omega) = \frac{i}{2\pi}\mathrm{Tr}\Omega \quad , \tag{3.B.8}$$

$$c_2(\Omega) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Omega\wedge\Omega - \mathrm{Tr}\Omega\wedge\mathrm{Tr}\Omega\Big] \quad , \tag{3.B.9}$$

plus infinitely many other formulae that can be derived from the expansion of the determinant in (3.B.6). Since $Q(\Omega)$ is closed, one finds that any homogeneous polynomial in the expansion of a characteristic polynomial is closed:

$$d\, c_j(\Omega) = 0 \quad . \tag{3.B.10}$$

This means that the Chern forms, $c_j(\Omega)$, define cohomology classes belonging to $H^{2j}(M)$.

(iii) The *Chern numbers* of a fibre bundle are the numbers found by integrating characteristic polynomials over the manifold. For example, one has

$$C_2(E) \equiv \int_M c_2(\Omega) \quad . \tag{3.B.11}$$

(iv) *Pontrjagin classes*, say $p_k(E)$, and *Pontrjagin numbers*, are the counterpart, for *real* vector bundles, of Chern classes and Chern numbers for complex vector bundles.

(v) In the course of studying index theorems, one needs certain combinations of characteristic classes. The first example is provided by the *Chern character*, defined by the invariant polynomial

$$ch(E) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\exp(im/2\pi) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!}\mathrm{Tr}(im/2\pi)^l \quad . \tag{3.B.12}$$

A deep and simple relation exists between the Chern character and Chern classes, i.e.

$$ch(E) = \sum_{l=1}^{k} \exp(i\Omega_l/2\pi) = k + c_1(E) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(c_1^2 - 2c_2\Big)(E) + ... \quad . \tag{3.B.13}$$

(vi) Yet another deep concept is the one of *genus*, i.e. a combination of characteristic classes that satisfies the Whitney sum property:

$$f(E \oplus E') = f(E)f(E') \quad . \tag{3.B.14}$$

It is now convenient to set

$$k_l \equiv \frac{i}{2\pi}\Omega_l \quad . \tag{3.B.15}$$

It is then possible to express the *Todd class* as follows:

$$td(E) \equiv \prod_{l=1}^{k} \frac{x_l}{1-\exp(-x_l)} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}c_1(E) + \frac{1}{12}\Big(c_1^2 + c_2\Big)(E) + ... \quad . \tag{3.B.16}$$

Other relevant examples of genera are given by the *Hirzebruch L-polynomial*, i.e.

$$L(E) \equiv \prod_{l} \frac{x_l}{\tanh(x_l)} \quad , \tag{3.B.17}$$

and the $\hat{A}$ polynomial

$$\hat{A}(E) \equiv \prod_{l} \frac{x_l/2}{\sinh(x_l/2)} = 1 - \frac{1}{24}p_1 + \frac{1}{5760}\Big(7p_1^2 - 4p_2\Big) + ... \quad . \tag{3.B.18}$$

(vii) A further important set of characteristic classes consists of the Stiefel-Whitney classes. Unlike all characteristic classes described previously, they cannot be represented by differential forms in terms of curvature, and are not integral cohomology classes (Milnor and Stasheff 1974, Rennie 1990). By definition, Stiefel-Whitney classes are the Z_2 cohomology classes of a *real* bundle, say E, over M, with k-dimensional fibre:

$$w_i \in H^i(M; Z_2) \quad , \quad i = 1, ..., n-1 \quad . \tag{3.B.19}$$

The *total Stiefel-Whitney class* is defined by

$$w(E) \equiv 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} w_l \quad . \tag{3.B.20}$$

The vanishing of the first Stiefel-Whitney class $w_1(TM)$ provides a necessary and sufficient condition for the orientability of M. The vanishing of the second Stiefel-Whitney class $w_2(TM)$ is instead a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of spin-structures (see sections 1.2, 1.3 and Milnor 1963).

CHAPTER FOUR

SPECTRAL ASYMMETRY

Abstract. The investigations in spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry by Atiyah, Patodi and Singer begin by studying, for a Riemannian manifold, say M, the relation between the signature of the quadratic form on $H^2(M;\Re)$ and the integral over M of the first Pontrjagin class. It turns out that, if M has a boundary, the desired relation involves also the value at the origin of the η-function obtained from the eigenvalues of a first-order differential operator. The result is indeed an example of index theorem for non-local boundary conditions. The second part of the chapter performs a detailed $\eta(0)$ calculation with non-local boundary conditions. Last, the $\eta(0)$ value is obtained for a first-order operator with periodic boundary conditions.

4.1 Spectral Asymmetry and Riemannian Geometry

If M is an oriented, n- (even) dimensional Riemannian manifold, the Gauss-Bonnet-Chern theorem provides a first relevant example of a deep formula relating cohomological invariants with curvature. In intrinsic language, the Euler number χ of M, defined as an alternating sum of Betti numbers:

$$\chi \equiv \sum_{p=0}^{n} (-1)^p B_p \quad , \tag{4.1.1}$$

reads (Chern 1944–45, Greub et al. 1973, Dowker and Schofield 1990)

$$\chi = \int_M \Lambda + \int_{\partial M} X^* \Pi \quad , \tag{4.1.2a}$$

where the vector field X can be chosen as any extension of the normal vector field $\mathbf{n}$ on the boundary ∂M. Moreover, Π is an $(n-1)$-form on the unit tangent bundle of M, the sphere-bundle $S(M)$, and Λ is an n-form such that $\pi^*\Lambda$ is the Pfaffian of the curvature matrix, where π^* maps the cohomology of M into that of $S(M)$. For example, in the two-dimensional case Eq. (4.1.2a) reduces to

$$\chi = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_M R + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial M} \mathrm{Tr} K \quad , \tag{4.1.2b}$$

where R is the trace of the Ricci tensor, and K is the second fundamental form of the boundary of M (see section 5.2).

When M is four-dimensional, in addition to (4.1.2a) there is another formula which relates cohomological invariants with curvature. In fact, it is known that the signature (i.e. number of positive eigenvalues minus number of negative eigenvalues) of the quadratic form on $H^2(M; \Re)$ given by the cup-product (see section 2.3 and Atiyah 1975a) is expressed, for manifolds without boundary, by

$$\mathrm{sign}(M) = \frac{1}{3} \int_M p_1 \quad . \tag{4.1.3}$$

In (4.1.3), p_1 is the differential four-form which represents the first Pontrjagin class, and is equal to $(2\pi)^{-2}\ \mathrm{Tr}(R^2)$, where R is the curvature matrix. However, (4.1.3) does not hold in general for manifolds with boundary, so that one has

$$\mathrm{sign}(M) - \frac{1}{3}\int_M p_1 = f(Y) \neq 0 \quad , \tag{4.1.4}$$

where $Y \equiv \partial M$. Thus, if M' is another manifold with the same boundary, i.e. such that $Y = \partial M'$, one has

$$\mathrm{sign}(M) - \frac{1}{3}\int_M p_1 = \mathrm{sign}(M') - \frac{1}{3}\int_{M'} p_1' \quad . \tag{4.1.5}$$

Hence one is looking for a continuous function f of the metric on Y such that $f(-Y) = -f(Y)$. Atiyah et al. (1975) were able to prove that $f(Y)$ is a spectral invariant, evaluated as follows. One looks at the Laplace operator $\triangle$ acting on forms as well as on scalar functions. This operator $\triangle$ is the square of the self-adjoint first-order operator $B \equiv \pm\Big(d* - *d\Big)$, where d is the exterior-derivative operator, and $*$ is the Hodge-star operator mapping p-forms to $(l-p)$-forms in l dimensions. Thus, if λ is an eigenvalue of B, the eigenvalues of $\triangle$ are of the form λ^2. However, the eigenvalues of B can be both negative and positive. One takes this property into account by defining the η-function

$$\eta(s) \equiv \sum_{\lambda\neq 0} d(\lambda)(\mathrm{sign}(\lambda))|\ \lambda\ |^{-s} \quad , \tag{4.1.6}$$

where $d(\lambda)$ is the multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ. Note that, since B involves the $*$ operator, in reversing the orientation of the boundary Y we change B into $-B$, and hence $\eta(s)$ into $-\eta(s)$. The main result of Atiyah et al., in its simplest form, states therefore that (Atiyah et al. 1975, Atiyah 1975b)

$$f(Y) = \frac{1}{2}\eta(0) \quad . \tag{4.1.7}$$

Now, for a manifold M with boundary Y, if one tries to set up an elliptic boundary-value problem for the signature operator of section 2.3, one finds that there is

no local boundary condition for this operator. For global boundary conditions, however, expressed by the vanishing of a given integral evaluated on Y, one has a good elliptic theory and a finite index. Thus, one has to consider the theorem expressed by (4.1.7) within the framework of index theorems for global boundary conditions. Atiyah et al. (1975) were also able to derive the relation between the index of the Dirac operator on M with a global boundary condition and $\eta(0)$, where η is the η-function of the Dirac operator on the boundary of M (cf. (6.1.4) and (6.1.5)).

4.2 $\eta(0)$ Calculation

Following Atiyah et al. 1975, we now evaluate $\eta(0)$ in a specific example. Let Y be a closed manifold, E a vector bundle over Y and $A : C^\infty(Y, E) \to C^\infty(Y, E)$ a self-adjoint, elliptic, first-order differential operator. By virtue of this hypothesis, A has a discrete spectrum with real eigenvalues λ and eigenfunctions ϕ_λ. Let P denote the projection of $C^\infty(Y, E)$ onto the space spanned by the ϕ_λ for $\lambda \geq 0$. We now form the product $Y \times \Re^+$ of Y with the half-line $u \geq 0$ and consider the operator

$$D \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + A \quad , \tag{4.2.1}$$

acting on sections $f(y, u)$ of E lifted to $Y \times \Re^+$ (still denoted by E). Clearly D is elliptic and its *formal* adjoint is

$$D^* \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial u} + A \quad . \tag{4.2.2}$$

The following boundary condition is imposed for D:

$$Pf(\cdot, 0) = 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.3}$$

This is a *global* condition for the boundary value $f(\cdot,0)$ in that it is equivalent to

$$\int_Y \Big(f(y,0), \phi_\lambda(y) \Big) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.4}$$

Of course, the adjoint boundary condition to (4.2.3) is

$$(1-P) f(\cdot,0) = 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.5}$$

The naturally occurring second-order self-adjoint operators obtained from D are

$$\triangle_1 \equiv \mathcal{D}^* \mathcal{D} \quad , \tag{4.2.6}$$

$$\triangle_2 \equiv \mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}^* \quad , \tag{4.2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is the closure of the operator D on L^2 with domain given by (4.2.3). For $t > 0$, one can then consider the bounded operators $e^{-t\triangle_1}$ and $e^{-t\triangle_2}$. The explicit kernels of these operators will be given in terms of the eigenfunctions ϕ_λ of A. For this purpose, consider first $\triangle_1$, i.e. the operator given by

$$-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} + A^2$$

with the boundary condition

$$P f(\cdot,0) = 0 \quad , \tag{4.2.8a}$$

and

$$(1-P)\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} + Af \right)_{u=0} = 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.8b}$$

Expansion in terms of the ϕ_λ, so that $f(y,u) = \sum_\lambda f_\lambda(u) \phi_\lambda(y)$, shows that for each λ one has to study the operator

$$-\frac{d^2}{du^2} + \lambda^2$$

on $u \geq 0$ with the boundary conditions

$$f_\lambda(0) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda \geq 0 \quad , \tag{4.2.9}$$

$$\left(\frac{df_\lambda}{du} + \lambda f_\lambda\right)_{u=0} = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.10}$$

It should be stressed, once more, that (4.2.9) and (4.2.10) are non-local, since they rely on the separation of the spectrum of A into its positive and negative part (cf. section 6.1).

The fundamental solution for

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} + \lambda^2$$

with the boundary condition (4.2.9) is found to be

$$W_A = \frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(u-v)^2}{4t}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{-(u+v)^2}{4t}\right)\right] \quad . \tag{4.2.11}$$

By contrast, when the boundary condition (4.2.10) is imposed, the use of the Laplace transform leads to (Carslaw and Jaeger 1959)

$$W_B = \frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(u-v)^2}{4t}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-(u+v)^2}{4t}\right)\right] + \lambda e^{-\lambda(u+v)} \operatorname{erfc}\left[\frac{(u+v)}{2\sqrt{t}} - \lambda\sqrt{t}\right] \quad , \tag{4.2.12}$$

where erfc is the (complementary) error function defined by

$$\operatorname{erfc}(x) \equiv \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-\xi^2}\, d\xi \quad . \tag{4.2.13}$$

Thus, the kernel K_1 of $e^{-t\triangle_1}$ at a point $(t; y, u; z, v)$ is obtained as

$$K_1(t; y, u; z, v) = \sum_\lambda W_A \phi_\lambda(y) \overline{\phi_\lambda(z)} \quad \text{if } \lambda \geq 0 \quad , \tag{4.2.14}$$

$$K_1(t; y, u; z, v) = \sum_\lambda W_B \phi_\lambda(y) \overline{\phi_\lambda(z)} \quad \text{if } \lambda < 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.15}$$

For the operator $\triangle_2$, the boundary conditions for each λ are

$$f_\lambda(0) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda < 0 \quad , \tag{4.2.16}$$

$$\left(-\frac{df_\lambda}{du}+\lambda f_\lambda\right)_{u=0}=0 \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda\geq 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.17}$$

The fundamental solution for

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}+\lambda^2$$

subject to (4.2.16) is $\widetilde{W}_A = W_A$, while for the boundary conditions (4.2.17) one finds $\widetilde{W}_B = W_B(-\lambda)$. Moreover, by virtue of the inequality

$$\int_x^\infty e^{-\xi^2}\, d\xi < e^{-x^2} \quad , \tag{4.2.18}$$

W_A and W_B are both bounded by

$$F_\lambda(t;u,v)\equiv\left[\frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{\pi t}}+\frac{2\mid\lambda\mid}{\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-\lambda^2 t}\right]\exp\left(\frac{-(u-v)^2}{4t}\right) \quad . \tag{4.2.19}$$

If one now multiplies and divides by $\sqrt{t}$ the second term in square brackets in (4.2.19), application of the inequality

$$x\leq e^{x^2/2} \quad , \tag{4.2.20}$$

to the resulting term $\mid\lambda\mid\sqrt{t}$ shows that the kernel $K_1(t;y,u;z,v)$ of $e^{-t\triangle_1}$ is bounded by

$$G(t;y,u;z,v)\equiv\frac{3}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\left[\sum_\lambda e^{-\lambda^2 t/2}\left(\mid\phi_\lambda(y)\mid^2 +\mid\phi_\lambda(z)\mid^2\right)\right]\exp\left(\frac{-(u-v)^2}{4t}\right) \quad . \tag{4.2.21}$$

Moreover, since the kernel of $e^{-t\triangle_2}$ on the diagonal of $Y\times Y$ is bounded by $Ct^{-n/2}$, one finds that the kernels of $e^{-t\triangle_1}$ and $e^{-t\triangle_2}$ are exponentially small in t as $t\to 0^+$ for $u\neq v$, in that they are bounded by

$$C\, t^{-(n+1)/2}\exp\left(\frac{-(u-v)^2}{4t}\right) \quad ,$$

where C is some constant, as $t \to 0^+$.

Thus, the contribution outside the diagonal is asymptotically negligible, so that we are mainly interested in the contribution from the diagonal. For this purpose, we study $K(t,y,u)$, i.e. the kernel of $e^{-t\triangle_1} - e^{-t\triangle_2}$ at the point $(y,u;y,u)$ of $(Y \times \Re^+) \times (Y \times \Re^+)$. Defining $\text{sign}(\lambda) \equiv +1 \; \forall \lambda \geq 0$, $\text{sign}(\lambda) \equiv -1 \; \forall \lambda < 0$, one thus finds

$$\begin{aligned}
K(t,y,u) \equiv & \Big[W_A(t;y,u;y,u) - \widetilde{W}_B(t;y,u;y,u)\Big] + \Big[W_B(t;y,u;y,u) - \widetilde{W}_A(t;y,u;y,u)\Big] \\
&= \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \mid \phi_\lambda(y) \mid^2 \left[\frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left(1 - e^{-u^2/t}\right) - \frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left(1 + e^{-u^2/t}\right) \right. \\
&\left. -(-\lambda) e^{2\lambda u} \text{erfc} \left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{t}} + \lambda\sqrt{t} \right) \right] \\
&+ \sum_{\lambda < 0} \mid \phi_\lambda(y) \mid^2 \left[\frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left(1 + e^{-u^2/t}\right) + \lambda e^{-2\lambda u} \text{erfc} \left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{t}} - \lambda\sqrt{t} \right) \right. \\
&\left. - \frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \left(1 - e^{-u^2/t}\right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\lambda} \mid \phi_\lambda(y) \mid^2 \text{sign}(\lambda) \left[- \frac{e^{-\lambda^2 t} e^{-u^2/t}}{\sqrt{\pi t}} + \mid \lambda \mid e^{2|\lambda| u} \text{erfc} \left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{t}} + \mid \lambda \mid \sqrt{t} \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\lambda} \mid \phi_\lambda(y) \mid^2 \text{sign}(\lambda) \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left[\frac{1}{2} e^{2|\lambda| u} \text{erfc} \left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{t}} + \mid \lambda \mid \sqrt{t} \right) \right] \quad . \qquad (4.2.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, integration on $Y \times \Re^+$ and elementary rules for taking limits yield

$$K(t) \equiv \int_0^\infty \int_Y K(t,y,u) dy \, du = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_\lambda \text{sign}(\lambda) \, \text{erfc}(\mid \lambda \mid \sqrt{t}) \quad , \qquad (4.2.23)$$

which implies (on differentiating the error function and using the signature of eigenvalues)

$$K'(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \sum_\lambda \lambda e^{-\lambda^2 t} \quad . \qquad (4.2.24)$$

It is now necessary to derive the limiting behaviour of the (integrated) kernel (4.2.23) as $t \to \infty$ and as $t \to 0^+$. Indeed, denoting by h the degeneracy of the zero-eigenvalue, one finds

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} K(t) = -\frac{h}{2} \quad , \tag{4.2.25}$$

whereas, as $t \to 0^+$, the following bound holds:

$$\mid K(t) \mid \leq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda} \mathrm{erfc}(\mid \lambda \mid \sqrt{t}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sum_{\lambda} e^{-\lambda^2 t} < C\, t^{-n/2} \quad , \tag{4.2.26}$$

where C is a constant. Moreover, the result (4.2.25) may be supplemented by saying that $K(t)+\frac{h}{2}$ tends to 0 exponentially as $t \to \infty$. Thus, combining (4.2.25), (4.2.26) and this property, one finds that, for $Re(s)$ sufficiently large, the integral

$$I(s) \equiv \int_0^\infty \Big(K(t) + \frac{h}{2}\Big) t^{s-1}\, dt \quad , \tag{4.2.27}$$

converges. Integration by parts, definition of the Γ function

$$\Gamma(z) \equiv \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t}\, dt = k^z \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-kt}\, dt \quad , \tag{4.2.28}$$

and careful consideration of positive and negative eigenvalues with their signatures then lead to

$$I(s) = -\frac{\Gamma\left(s+\frac{1}{2}\right)}{2s\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{\lambda} \frac{\mathrm{sign}(\lambda)}{\mid \lambda \mid^{2s}} = -\frac{\Gamma\left(s+\frac{1}{2}\right)}{2s\sqrt{\pi}} \eta(2s) \quad . \tag{4.2.29}$$

The following analysis relies entirely on the *assumption* than an asymptotic expansion of the integrated kernel $K(t)$ exists as $t \to 0^+$. By writing such an expansion in the form

$$K(t) \sim \sum_{k \geq -m} a_k t^{k/2} \quad , \tag{4.2.30}$$

equations (4.2.27)-(4.2.30) yield (on splitting the integral (4.2.27) into an integral from 0 to 1 plus an integral from 1 to ∞)

$$\eta(2s) \sim -\frac{2s\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma\left(s+\frac{1}{2}\right)}\left[\frac{h}{2s}+\sum_{k=-m}^{N}\frac{a_k}{\left(\frac{k}{2}+s\right)}+\theta_N(s)\right] \quad . \tag{4.2.31}$$

This is the analytic continuation of $\eta(2s)$ to the whole s-plane. Hence one finds

$$\eta(0) = -\Big(2a_0+h\Big) \quad . \tag{4.2.32}$$

Regularity at the origin of the η-function is an important property in the theory of elliptic operators on manifolds. What one can prove (Atiyah et al. 1976, Gilkey 1995) is that the analytic continuation of the η-function of a given elliptic operator A:

$$\eta_A(s) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\left[A|\ A\ |^{-s-1}\right] \quad , \tag{4.2.33}$$

is a meromorphic function which is regular at $s=0$. Interestingly, such a property is stable under homotopy, i.e. under a smooth variation of A. More precisely, one considers a C^∞ one-parameter family A_u of elliptic operators, and one proves that the residue $R(A_u)$ at $s=0$ of the corresponding η-functions is constant, i.e.

$$\frac{d}{du}R(A_u) = 0 \quad . \tag{4.2.34}$$

Thus, the general formula for the analytic continuation of the η-function of A reduces to (cf. Atiyah et al. 1976)

$$\eta(s) = \sum_{k=-m}^{N}\frac{b_k}{(s+\frac{k}{n})}+\phi_N(s)\ \ ,\ \ k\neq 0 \quad , \tag{4.2.35}$$

where m is the dimension of the (compact) Riemannian manifold, n is the order of A, ϕ_N is holomorphic in the half-plane $\mathrm{Re}(s) > -\frac{N}{n}$, and is C^∞.

4.3 A Further Example

It is instructive to describe a simpler example of $\eta(0)$ calculation for first-order differential operators. For this purpose, we consider the first-order operator

$$A \equiv i\frac{d}{dx} + t \quad , \tag{4.3.1}$$

where t is a real parameter lying in the open interval $]0,1[$, and x is an angular coordinate on the circle. The boundary conditions on the eigenfunctions of A, denoted by f, are periodicity of period 2π:

$$f(x) = f(x + 2\pi) \quad . \tag{4.3.2}$$

Thus, since the eigenvalue equation for A:

$$i\frac{df}{dx} + tf = \lambda\, f \tag{4.3.3}$$

is solved by (f_0 being $f(x = 0)$)

$$f = f_0\, e^{-i(\lambda - t)x} \quad , \tag{4.3.4}$$

one finds, by virtue of (4.3.2), the eigenvalue condition

$$e^{-i(\lambda - t)2\pi} = 1 \quad . \tag{4.3.5}$$

Equation (4.3.5) is solved by

$$\lambda = t \pm n \quad \forall n = 0, 1, 2, ... \quad . \tag{4.3.6}$$

One can now form the corresponding η-function:

$$\eta_t(s) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (r + t)^{-s} - \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} (r - t)^{-s} \quad , \tag{4.3.7}$$

which can be re-arranged as follows:

$$\eta_t(s) = t^{-s} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left[(r-t)^s - (r+t)^s\right]}{(r+t)^s(r-t)^s}$$

$$= t^{-s} - 2st \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} r^{-(s+1)} + s\Sigma_1 \quad . \tag{4.3.8}$$

In Eq. (4.3.8), Σ_1 is a series which is absolutely convergent in the neighbourhood of $s = 0$. One thus finds

$$\eta_t(0) = 1 - 2t \lim_{s \to 0} s\zeta_R(s+1) = 1 - 2t \quad , \tag{4.3.9}$$

where ζ_R is the Riemann ζ-function, defined as

$$\zeta_R(s) \equiv \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-s} \quad . \tag{4.3.10}$$

The result (4.3.9) shows that, unless t takes the value $\frac{1}{2}$, there will be a "spectral asymmetry" expressed by a non-vanishing value of $\eta_t(0)$.

It has been our choice to give a very elementary introduction to the subject of the η-function. The reader who is interested in advanced topics is referred to Berline et al. 1992, Branson and Gilkey 1992a–b, Booss-Bavnbek and Wojciechowski 1993, Falomir et al. 1996. Further work on the Dirac operator and its eigenvalues can be found in Hortacsu et al. 1980, Atiyah and Singer 1984, Vafa and Witten 1984, Atiyah 1985, Polychronakos 1987, Connes 1995, Camporesi and Higuchi 1996, Landi and Rovelli 1996, Carow-Watamura and Watamura 1997.

CHAPTER FIVE

SPECTRAL GEOMETRY WITH OPERATORS OF LAPLACE TYPE

Abstract. Spectral geometry with operators of Laplace type is introduced by discussing the inverse problem in the theory of vibrating membranes. This means that a given spectrum of eigenvalues is given, and one would like to determine uniquely the shape of the vibrating object from the asymptotic expansion of the integrated heat kernel. It turns out that, in general, it is not possible to tell whether the membrane is convex, or smooth, or simply connected, but results of a limited nature can be obtained. These determine, for example, the volume and the surface area of the body. Starting from these examples, the very existence of the asymptotic expansion of the integrated heat hernel is discussed, relying on the seminal paper by Greiner. A more careful analysis of the boundary-value problem is then performed, and the recent results on the asymptotics of the Laplacian on a manifold with boundary are presented in detail. For this purpose, one studies second-order elliptic operators with leading symbol given by the metric. The behaviour of the differential operator, boundary operator and heat-kernel coefficients under conformal rescalings of the background metric leads to a set of algebraic equations which determine completely the heat-kernel asymptotics. Such property holds whenever one studies boundary conditions of Dirichlet or Robin type, or a mixture of the two. The chapter ends by describing the heat-equation approach to index theorems, and the link between heat equation and ζ-function.

5.1 On Hearing the Shape of a Drum

A classical problem in spectral geometry, which is used here to introduce the topic, consists in the attempt to deduce the shape of a drum from the knowledge of its spectrum of eigenvalues, say λ_n. Some progress is possible on establishing the leading terms of the asymptotic expansion of the trace function (cf. section 5.2)

$$\Theta(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} \quad , \tag{5.1.1}$$

for small positive values of t. In particular, if one studies a simply connected membrane Ω bounded by a smooth convex plane Γ, for which the displacement satisfies the wave equation

$$\triangle\phi = \frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial t^2} \quad , \tag{5.1.2}$$

and Dirichlet boundary conditions on Γ:

$$\Big[\phi\Big]_{\Gamma} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.1.3}$$

one finds

$$\Theta(t) \sim \frac{|\,\Omega\,|}{4\pi t} - \frac{L}{8\sqrt{\pi t}} + \frac{1}{6} \quad . \tag{5.1.4}$$

In (5.1.4), $|\,\Omega\,|$ is the area of Ω, L is the length of Γ, and the constant $\frac{1}{6}$ results from integration of the curvature of the boundary. Moreover, if Ω has a finite number of smooth convex holes, such a term should be replaced by $\frac{1}{6}(1-r)$, where r is the number of holes. The two basic problems in the heat-equation approach to drums and vibrating membranes are as follows (Kac 1966, Stewartson and Waechter 1971, Waechter 1972):

(i) Given a set $\{\lambda_n\}$, can a corresponding shape be found ? If so, is it unique ?

(ii) Let $\{\lambda_n\}$ be a given spectrum of eigenvalues. Can the shape be uniquely determined from the asymptotic expansion of $\Theta(t)$ for small positive t ?

In Stewartson and Waechter 1971, the authors obtained the asymptotic expansion of $\Theta(t)$ for a membrane bounded by a smooth boundary. They found that, when the restriction of convexity is relaxed, and corners and cusps are permitted, the shape can be determined precisely if the membrane is circular; otherwise the asymptotic expansion of $\Theta(t)$ as $t \to 0^+$ determines the area, the length of the perimeter and the existence of outward pointing cusps. Thus, in general, *it is not possible* to tell whether the membrane is convex, or smooth, or simply connected. Whether it is possible to do so from the complete asymptotic expansion of $\Theta(t)$ remained, and remains, an open problem.

In the following sections we will give a rigorous description of heat-kernel methods, but here we can complete the outline of the Green-function approach, following again Stewartson and Waechter (1971). Indeed, if $G(r, r'; t)$ is the Green's function of the diffusion (or heat) equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \triangle\right) \phi = 0 \quad , \tag{5.1.5}$$

subject to the Dirichlet condition

$$G(r, r'; t) = 0 \ \text{ if } \ r \in \Gamma \quad , \tag{5.1.6}$$

and behaving as a Dirac delta: $\delta(r - r')$, as $t \to 0^+$, the trace function $\Theta(t)$ is defined by the equation

$$\Theta(t) \equiv \int \int_{\Omega} G(r, r; t) d\Omega \quad . \tag{5.1.7}$$

Thus, if one writes

$$G(r, r'; t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} \phi_n(r) \phi_n(r') \quad , \tag{5.1.8}$$

where λ_n are the eigenvalues of the operator $-\triangle$, and ϕ_n are the normalized eigenfunctions, the result (5.1.1) follows on setting $r = r'$ and integrating over Ω. In many applications it is useful to consider the split

$$G(r, r'; t) = G_0(r, r'; t) + \chi(r, r'; t) \quad , \tag{5.1.9}$$

where (setting $R \equiv \mid r - r' \mid$)

$$G_0(r, r'; t) = \frac{1}{4\pi t} e^{-R^2/4t} \tag{5.1.10}$$

is the Green's function for the infinite plane, and $\chi(r, r'; t)$ is the compensating solution of the heat equation (5.1.5), which satisfies the appropriate boundary condition on Γ.

In Waechter 1972, the author extended the early investigation of the inverse eigenvalue problem for vibrating membranes to three or more dimensions. Thus, he considered the boundary-value problem

$$- \triangle \phi = \lambda \phi \ \text{ in } \ \Omega \quad , \tag{5.1.11}$$

$$\phi = 0 \ \text{ on } \ S \quad , \tag{5.1.12}$$

where Ω is a closed convex region or body in the n-dimensional Euclidean space E^n, and S is the bounding surface of Ω. Once more, the problem was to determine the precise shape of Ω, on being given the spectrum of eigenvalues λ_n and the heat equation (5.1.5), whose Green's function satisfies the boundary condition

$$G(r, r'; t) = 0 \ \text{ if } \ r \in S \quad . \tag{5.1.13}$$

The method was always to use the trace function

$$\Theta(t) \equiv \int \int \int_{\Omega} G(r, r; t) d\Omega \tag{5.1.14}$$

to determine the leading terms of the asymptotic expansion of $\Theta(t)$ for small positive t. Interestingly, even in the higher-dimensional problem, results of a limited nature can be obtained. For example, the first six terms of the expansion of $\Theta(t)$ for a sphere were determined, and for a smooth convex body Waechter found the first four terms:

$$\Theta(t) \sim \frac{V}{(4\pi t)^{3/2}} - \frac{S}{16\pi t} + \frac{M}{6\pi\sqrt{4\pi t}} + \frac{1}{512\pi} \int \int_S (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)^2 dS + \mathrm{O}(\sqrt{t}) \ . \tag{5.1.15}$$

With the notation in Waechter 1972, V and S are the volume and surface area of the body Ω, respectively, M is the surface integral of mean curvature:

$$M \equiv \int\int \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2) dS \quad , \tag{5.1.16}$$

while κ_1 and κ_2 are the principal curvatures at the surface element dS of the body surface.

So far, nothing has been said about the actual *existence* of the asymptotic expansion of the trace function. The proof is a very important result due to Greiner (1971). Although we can only refer the reader to the original paper by Greiner for the detailed proof, one can describe, however, the mathematical framework, since this will help to achieve a smooth transition towards the following sections. We can thus say that Greiner studied a compact m-dimensional C^∞ Riemannian manifold, say M, with C^∞ boundary, say ∂M. The boundary-value problem consists of the pair (P, B), where P is an elliptic differential operator of order $2n$:

$$P : C^\infty(V_M) \to C^\infty(V_M) \quad , \tag{5.1.17}$$

with V_M a C^∞ (complex) vector bundle over M, and is such that $P + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ is parabolic. One then says that P is p-elliptic. An example is the operator in round brackets in Eq. (5.1.5), with P being equal to $-\triangle$. Moreover, the *boundary operator* is a map

$$B : C^\infty(V_M) \to C^\infty(G_{\partial M}) \quad , \tag{5.1.18}$$

where $G_{\partial M}$ is a C^∞ (complex) vector bundle over ∂M. To obtain the Green's *kernel* $G(x, y; t)$ of e^{-tP}, Greiner constructed an operator C with kernel $C(x, y; t)$, compensating for the boundary, such that

$$G(x, y; t) = H(x, y; t) - C(x, y; t) \quad , \tag{5.1.19}$$

where $H(x, y; t)$ is the kernel of e^{-tP} for a manifold without boundary. Greiner's result states therefore that, for the integrated (heat) kernel

$$G(t) \equiv \int_M \mathrm{Tr} G(x, x; t) dx = \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}(e^{-tP}) \tag{5.1.20}$$

an asymptotic expansion exists, as $t \to 0^+$, in the form (cf. Greiner 1971)

$$G(t) \sim t^{-m/2n}\Big[G_0 + G_1 t^{1/2n} + ... + G_k t^{k/2n} + ...\Big] \quad , \tag{5.1.21}$$

where

$$G_0 = H_0 \quad , \tag{5.1.22}$$

$$G_k = H_k - C_k \quad , \quad k = 1, 2, ... \quad , \tag{5.1.23}$$

$$C_k = \int_{\partial M} C_k(x')dx' \quad . \tag{5.1.24}$$

Note that the trace in the integral (5.1.20) is the fibre trace, and that in the mathematics literature one also says that $G(x, y; t)$ is the Green's kernel for the boundary-value problem $\left(P + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, B\right)$. The following sections are devoted to a precise characterization of the G_k coefficients occurring in the asymptotic expansion (5.1.21).

5.2 Asymptotics of the Laplacian on a Manifold with Boundary

Following Branson and Gilkey 1990, we are interested in a second-order differential operator, say P, with leading symbol given by the metric tensor on a compact m-dimensional Riemannian manifold M with boundary ∂M. Denoting by ∇ the connection on the vector bundle $V = V_M$, our assumption implies that P, called an operator of Laplace type, reads

$$P = -g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b - E \quad , \tag{5.2.1}$$

where E is an endomorphism of V. The heat equation for the operator P is (cf. (5.1.5))

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + P\right) F(x, x'; t) = 0 \quad . \tag{5.2.2}$$

By definition, the *heat kernel* (cf. section 5.1) is the solution of Eq. (5.2.2) subject to the boundary condition

$$\Big[\mathcal{B}F(x,x';t)\Big]_{\partial M}=0 \quad , \tag{5.2.3}$$

jointly with the (initial) condition

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\int_M F(x,x';t)\rho(x')dx'=\rho(x) \quad , \tag{5.2.4}$$

which is a rigorous mathematical expression for the Dirac delta behaviour as $t\to 0^+$ (cf. section 5.1). The heat kernel can be written as (cf. (5.1.8))

$$F(x,x';t)=\sum_{(n)}\varphi_{(n)}(x)\varphi_{(n)}(x')e^{-\lambda_{(n)}t} \quad , \tag{5.2.5}$$

where $\big\{\varphi_{(n)}(x)\big\}$ is a complete orthonormal set of eigenfunctions with eigenvalues $\lambda_{(n)}$. The index n is enclosed in round brackets, to emphasize that, in general, a finite collection of integer labels occurs therein.

Since, by construction, the heat kernel behaves as a distribution in the neighbourhood of the boundary, it is convenient to introduce a smooth function, say $f\in C^\infty(M)$, and consider a slight generalization of the trace function (or integrated heat kernel) of section 5.1, i.e. $\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\Big(fe^{-tP}\Big)$. It is precisely the consideration of f that makes it possible to recover the distributional behaviour of the heat kernel near ∂M. A key idea is therefore to work with arbitrary f, and then set $f=1$ only when all coefficients in the asymptotic expansion

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\Big(fe^{-tP}\Big)\equiv\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[fF(x,x;t)\Big]dx\sim(4\pi t)^{-m/2}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}t^{n/2}a_{n/2}(f,P) \tag{5.2.6}$$

have been evaluated. The term $F(x,x;t)$ is called the *heat-kernel diagonal*. By virtue of Greiner's result, the coefficients $a_{n/2}(f,P)$, which are said to describe the *asymptotics*, are obtained by integrating *local* formulae. More precisely, they admit a split into integrals over M (interior terms) and over ∂M (boundary terms). In

such formulae, the integrands are linear combinations of all geometric invariants of the appropriate dimension (see below) which result from the Riemann curvature $R^a{}_{bcd}$ of the background, the extrinsic curvature of the boundary, the differential operator P (through the endomorphism E), and the boundary operator $\mathcal{B}$ (through the endomorphisms, or projection operators, or more general matrices occurring in it). With our notation, the indices $a, b, ...$ range from 1 through m and index a local orthonormal frame for the tangent bundle of M, TM, while the indices $i, j, ...$ range from 1 through $m-1$ and index the orthonormal frame for the tangent bundle of the boundary, $T(\partial M)$. The boundary is defined by the equations

$$\partial M : \qquad y^a = y^a(x) \quad , \tag{5.2.7}$$

in terms of the functions $y^a(x)$, x^i being the coordinates on ∂M, and the y^a those on M. Thus, the *intrinsic* metric, γ_{ij}, on the boundary hypersurface ∂M, is given in terms of the metric g_{ab} on M by (Eisenhart 1926, Dowker and Schofield 1989)

$$\gamma_{ij} = g_{ab}\, y^a{}_{,i}\, y^b{}_{,j} \quad . \tag{5.2.8}$$

On inverting this equation one finds (here, $n^a = N^a$ is the inward-pointing normal)

$$g^{ab} = q^{ab} + n^a n^b \quad , \tag{5.2.9}$$

where

$$q^{ab} = y^a{}_{,i}\, y^b{}_{,j}\, \gamma^{ij} \quad . \tag{5.2.10}$$

The tensor q^{ab} is equivalent to γ^{ij} and may be viewed as the *induced metric* on ∂M, in its contravariant form. The tensor $q^a{}_b$ is a projection operator, in that

$$q^a{}_b\, q^b{}_c = q^a{}_c \quad , \tag{5.2.11}$$

$$q^a{}_b\, n^b = 0 \quad . \tag{5.2.12}$$

The extrinsic-curvature tensor K_{ab} (or second fundamental form of ∂M) is defined by the projection of the covariant derivative of an *extension* of the outward, normal vector field $-n$:

$$K_{ab} \equiv -n_{c;d}\, q^c{}_a\, q^d{}_b \quad , \tag{5.2.13}$$

and is symmetric if the metric-compatible connection on M is torsion-free. Only its spatial components, K_{ij}, are non-vanishing.

The semicolon ; denotes multiple covariant differentiation with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇_M of M, while the stroke | denotes multiple covariant differentiation tangentially with respect to the Levi-Civita connection $\nabla_{\partial M}$ of the boundary. When sections of bundles built from V are involved, the semicolon means

$$\nabla_M \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \nabla \quad ,$$

and the stroke means

$$\nabla_{\partial M} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \nabla \quad .$$

The curvature of the connection ∇ on V is denoted by Ω.

When Dirichlet or Robin boundary conditions are imposed on sections of V:

$$[\phi]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.2.14}$$

or

$$\Big[(n^a \nabla_a + S)\phi\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.2.15}$$

the asymptotics in (5.2.6) is expressed through some *universal constants*

$$\{\alpha_i, b_i, c_i, d_i, e_i\}$$

such that (here $R_{ab} \equiv R^c{}_{abc}$ is the Ricci tensor, $R \equiv R^a{}_a$, and $\Box \equiv \nabla^a \nabla_a = g^{ab} \nabla_a \nabla_b$)

$$a_0(f, P) = \int_M \mathrm{Tr}(f) \quad , \tag{5.2.16}$$

$$a_{1/2}(f, P) = \delta (4\pi)^{1/2} \int_{\partial M} \mathrm{Tr}(f) \quad , \tag{5.2.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(f, P) &= \frac{1}{6} \int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_1 f E + \alpha_2 f R\Big] \\ &+ \frac{1}{6} \int_{\partial M} \mathrm{Tr}\Big[b_0 f (\mathrm{tr} K) + b_1 f_{;N} + b_2 f S\Big] \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.18}$$

$$a_{3/2}(f,P)=\frac{\delta}{96}(4\pi)^{1/2}\int_{\partial M}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[f(c_0E+c_1R+c_2R^{i}{}_{NiN}$$
$$+c_3(\mathrm{tr}K)^2+c_4K_{ij}K^{ij}+c_7S(\mathrm{tr}K)+c_8S^2\Big)$$
$$+f_{;N}\Big(c_5(\mathrm{tr}K)+c_9S\Big)+c_6f_{;NN}\Big] \quad , \tag{5.2.19}$$

$$a_2(f,P)=\frac{1}{360}\int_M\mathrm{Tr}\Big[f\Big(\alpha_3\Box E+\alpha_4RE+\alpha_5E^2+\alpha_6\Box R+\alpha_7R^2$$
$$+\alpha_8R_{ab}R^{ab}+\alpha_9R_{abcd}R^{abcd}+\alpha_{10}\Omega_{ab}\Omega^{ab}\Big)\Big]$$
$$+\frac{1}{360}\int_{\partial M}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[f\Big(d_1E_{;N}+d_2R_{;N}+d_3(\mathrm{tr}K)_{|i}{}^{|i}+d_4K_{ij}{}^{|ij}$$
$$+d_5E(\mathrm{tr}K)+d_6R(\mathrm{tr}K)+d_7R^{i}{}_{NiN}(\mathrm{tr}K)+d_8R_{iNjN}K^{ij}$$
$$+d_9R^{m}{}_{imj}K^{ij}+d_{10}(\mathrm{tr}K)^3+d_{11}K_{ij}K^{ij}(\mathrm{tr}K)$$
$$+d_{12}K_i{}^j\,K_j{}^l\,K_l{}^i+d_{13}\Omega_{iN;}{}^{i}+d_{14}SE+d_{15}SR$$
$$+d_{16}SR^{i}{}_{NiN}+d_{17}S(\mathrm{tr}K)^2+d_{18}SK_{ij}K^{ij}$$
$$+d_{19}S^2(\mathrm{tr}K)+d_{20}S^3+d_{21}S_{|i}{}^{|i}\Big)+f_{;N}\Big(e_1E+e_2R$$
$$+e_3R^{i}{}_{NiN}+e_4(\mathrm{tr}K)^2+e_5K_{ij}K^{ij}+e_8S(\mathrm{tr}K)+e_9S^2\Big)$$
$$+f_{;NN}\Big(e_6(\mathrm{tr}K)+e_{10}S\Big)+e_7f_{;a}{}^{a}{}_{N}\Big] \quad . \tag{5.2.20}$$

These formulae may seem to be very complicated, but there is indeed a systematic way to write them down and then compute the universal constants. To begin, note that, if k is odd, $a_{k/2}(f,P)$ receives contributions from boundary terms only, whereas both interior terms and boundary terms contribute to $a_{k/2}(f,P)$, if k is even and positive. In the a_1 coefficient, the integrand in the interior term must be linear in the curvature, and hence it can only be a linear combination of the trace of the Ricci tensor, and of the endomorphism E in the differential operator. In the a_2 coefficient, the integrand in the interior term must be quadratic in the curvature,

and hence one needs a linear combination of the eight geometric invariants (cf. Schwinger 1951, DeWitt 1965)

$$\Box E\ ,\ RE\ ,\ E^2\ ,\ \Box R\ ,\ R^2\ ,\ R_{ab}R^{ab}\ ,\ R_{abcd}R^{abcd}\ ,\ \Omega_{ab}\Omega^{ab}\ .$$

In the a_1 coefficient, the integrand in the boundary term is a local expression given by a linear combination of all invariants linear in the extrinsic curvature: $\mathrm{tr}K, S$ and $f_{;N}$. In the $a_{3/2}$ coefficient, the integrand in the boundary term must be quadratic in the extrinsic curvature. Thus, bearing in mind the Gauss-Codazzi equations, one finds the general result (5.2.19). Last, in the a_2 coefficient, the integrand in the boundary term must be cubic in the extrinsic curvature. This leads to the boundary integral in (5.2.20), bearing in mind that $f_{;N}$ is linear in K_{ij}, while $f_{;NN}$ is quadratic in K_{ij}.

Note that the interior invariants are built universally and polynomially from the metric tensor, its inverse, and the covariant derivatives of $R^a_{\ bcd}, \Omega_{ab}$ and E. By virtue of Weyl's work on the invariants of the orthogonal group (Weyl 1946, Branson and Gilkey 1990, Gilkey 1995), these polynomials can be formed using only tensor products and contraction of tensor arguments. Here, the structure group is $O(m)$. However, when a boundary occurs, the boundary structure group is $O(m-1)$. Weyl's theorem is used again to construct invariants as in the previous equations (Branson and Gilkey 1990).

5.3 Functorial Method

Let T be a map which carries finite-dimensional vector spaces into finite-dimensional vector spaces. Thus, to every vector space V one has an associated vector space $T(V)$. The map T is said to be a *continuous functor* if, for all V and W, the map

$$T : Hom(V, W) \longrightarrow Hom(T(V), T(W))$$

is continuous (Atiyah 1967).

In the theory of heat-kernels, the functorial method is nothing but the analysis of heat-equation asymptotics with respect to conformal variations. Indeed, the behaviour of classical and quantum field theories under conformal rescalings of the metric:

$$\widehat{g}_{ab} = \Omega^2 \, g_{ab} \quad , \tag{5.3.1}$$

with Ω a smooth function, is at the heart of many deep properties: light-cone structure, conformal curvature (i.e. the Weyl tensor), conformal-infinity techniques, massless free-field equations, twistor equation, twistor spaces, Hodge-star operator in four dimensions, conformal anomalies (Penrose and Rindler 1986, Ward and Wells 1990, Esposito 1994a, Esposito 1995, Esposito et al. 1997). In the functorial method, one chooses Ω in the form

$$\Omega = e^{\varepsilon f} \quad , \tag{5.3.2}$$

where ε is a real-valued parameter, and $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is the smooth function considered in section 5.2. One then deals with a one-parameter family of differential operators

$$P(\varepsilon) = e^{-2\varepsilon f} \, P(0) \quad , \tag{5.3.3}$$

boundary operators

$$\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon f} \, \mathcal{B}(0) \quad , \tag{5.3.4}$$

connections ∇^ε on V, endomorphisms $E(\varepsilon)$ of V, and metrics

$$g_{ab}(\varepsilon) = e^{2\varepsilon f} \, g_{ab}(0) \quad . \tag{5.3.5}$$

For example, the form (5.3.2) of the conformal factor should be inserted into the general formulae which describe the transformation of Christoffel symbols under conformal rescalings:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^a_{\ bc} = \Gamma^a_{\ bc} + \Omega^{-1} \Big(\delta^a_{\ b} \, \Omega_{,c} + \delta^a_{\ c} \, \Omega_{,b} - g_{bc} g^{ad} \Omega_{,d} \Big) \quad . \tag{5.3.6}$$

This makes it possible to obtain the conformal variation formulae for the Riemann tensor R^a_{bcd} and for all tensors involving the effect of Christoffel symbols. For the extrinsic-curvature tensor defined in Eq. (5.2.13) one finds

$$\widehat{K}_{ab} = \Omega K_{ab} - n_a \nabla_b \Omega + g_{ab} \nabla_{(n)} \Omega \quad , \tag{5.3.7}$$

which implies

$$K_{ij}(\varepsilon) = e^{\varepsilon f} \; K_{ij} - \varepsilon \; g_{ij} \; e^{\varepsilon f} \; f_{;N} \quad . \tag{5.3.8}$$

The application of these methods to heat-kernel asymptotics relies on the work by Branson et al. (1990) and Branson and Gilkey (1990). Within this framework, a crucial role is played by the following "functorial" formulae (F being another smooth function):

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} a_{n/2} \Big(1, e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0) \Big) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = (m-n) a_{n/2}(f, P(0)) \quad , \tag{5.3.9}$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} a_{n/2} \Big(1, P(0) - \varepsilon F \Big) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = a_{n/2-1}(F, P(0)) \quad , \tag{5.3.10}$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} a_{n/2} \Big(e^{-2\varepsilon f} F, e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0) \Big) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = 0 \quad . \tag{5.3.11}$$

Equation (5.3.11) is obtained when $m = n+2$. These properties can be proved by (formal) differentiation, as follows.

If the conformal variation of an operator of Laplace type reads

$$P(\varepsilon) = e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0) - \varepsilon F \quad , \tag{5.3.12}$$

one finds

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \Big(e^{-tP(\varepsilon)} \Big) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left[\Big(2tfP(0) + tF \Big) e^{-tP(0)} \right]$$

$$= -2t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(f \; e^{-tP(0)} \right) + t \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(F \; e^{-tP(0)} \right) \quad . \tag{5.3.13}$$

Moreover, by virtue of the asymptotic expansion (5.2.6), one has (the numerical factors $(4\pi)^{-m/2}$ are omitted for simplicity, since they do not affect the form of

Eqs. (5.3.9)–(5.3.11); following Branson and Gilkey 1990 one can, instead, absorb such factors into the definition of the coefficients $a_{n/2}(f,P)$)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\left(f\ e^{-tP(0)}\right) \sim -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(m-n)t^{\frac{n}{2}-\frac{m}{2}-1}\ a_{n/2}(f,P(0)) \quad . \tag{5.3.14}$$

Thus, if F vanishes, Eqs. (5.3.13) and (5.3.14) lead to the result (5.3.9). By contrast, if f is set to zero, one has $P(\varepsilon)=P(0)-\varepsilon F$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\left(e^{-tP(\varepsilon)}\right)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} &\sim t^{-m/2}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}t^{n/2+1}\ a_{n/2}(F,P(0)) \\ &= t^{-m/2}\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}t^{l/2}\ a_{l/2-1}(F,P(0)) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.15}$$

which leads in turn to Eq. (5.3.10). Last, to obtain the result (5.3.11), one considers the two-parameter conformal variation

$$P(\varepsilon,\gamma)=e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)-\gamma e^{-2\varepsilon f}F \quad . \tag{5.3.16}$$

Now in Eq. (5.3.9) we first replace n by $n+2$, and then set $m=n+2$. One then has, from Eq. (5.3.16):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}a_{n/2+1}(1,P(\varepsilon,\gamma))=0 \quad . \tag{5.3.17}$$

Equation (5.3.17) can be differentiated with respect to γ, i.e. (see (5.3.10))

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\gamma\partial\varepsilon}a_{n/2+1}(1,P(\varepsilon,\gamma)) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma}a_{n/2+1}\left(1,e^{-2\varepsilon f}(P(0)-\gamma F)\right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\varepsilon}a_{n/2}\left(e^{-2\varepsilon f}F,e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)\right) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.18}$$

and hence Eq. (5.3.11) is proved.

To deal with Robin boundary conditions (called Neumann in Branson and Gilkey 1990) one needs another lemma, which is proved following again Branson and Gilkey. What we obtain is indeed a particular case of a more general property,

which is proved in section 4 of Avramidi and Esposito 1997. Our starting point is M, a compact, connected one-dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary. In other words, one deals with the circle or with a closed interval. If

$$b : C^{\infty}(M) \longrightarrow \Re$$

is a smooth, real-valued function, one can form the first-order operator

$$A \equiv \frac{d}{dx} - b \quad , \tag{5.3.19}$$

and its (formal) adjoint

$$A^{\dagger} \equiv -\frac{d}{dx} - b \quad . \tag{5.3.20}$$

From these operators, one can form the second-order operators (cf. sections 5.5 and 5.6)

$$D_1 \equiv A^{\dagger} A = -\left[\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - b_x - b^2\right] \quad , \tag{5.3.21}$$

$$D_2 \equiv A A^{\dagger} = -\left[\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + b_x - b^2\right] \quad , \tag{5.3.22}$$

where $b_x \equiv \frac{db}{dx}$. For D_1, Dirichlet boundary conditions are taken, while Robin boundary conditions are assumed for D_2. Defining

$$f_x \equiv \frac{df}{dx} \quad , \quad f_{xx} \equiv \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} \quad ,$$

one then finds the result (cf. Branson and Gilkey 1990):

$$(n-1)\left[a_{n/2}(f, D_1) - a_{n/2}(f, D_2)\right] = a_{n/2-1}\Big(f_{xx} + 2bf_x, D_1\Big) \quad . \tag{5.3.23}$$

As a first step in the proof of (5.3.23), one takes a spectral resolution for D_1, say $\{\theta_\nu, \lambda_\nu\}$, where θ_ν is the eigenfunction of D_1 belonging to the eigenvalue λ_ν:

$$D_1 \, \theta_\nu = \lambda_\nu \, \theta_\nu \quad . \tag{5.3.24}$$

Thus, differentiation with respect to t of the heat-kernel diagonal:

$$K(t,x,x,D_1) = \sum_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\ \theta_\nu^2(x) \quad , \tag{5.3.25}$$

yields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}K(t,x,x,D_1) = -\sum_\nu \lambda_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\ \theta_\nu^2(x) = -\sum_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}(D_1\ \theta_\nu)\theta_\nu \quad . \tag{5.3.26}$$

Moreover, for any $\lambda_\nu \neq 0$, the set

$$\left\{\frac{A\theta_\nu}{\sqrt{\lambda_\nu}}, \lambda_\nu\right\}$$

provides a spectral resolution of D_2 on $\mathrm{Ker}(D_2)^\perp$, and one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}K(t,x,x,D_2) &= -\sum_{\lambda_\nu\neq 0} \lambda_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\ \theta_\nu^2(x) \\ &= -\sum_{\lambda_\nu\neq 0} e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\Big(\sqrt{\lambda_\nu}\ \theta_\nu\Big)\Big(\sqrt{\lambda_\nu}\ \theta_\nu\Big) = -\sum_{\lambda_\nu\neq 0} e^{-t\lambda_\nu}(A\theta_\nu)(A\theta_\nu)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{5.3.27}$$

Bearing in mind that $A\theta_\nu = 0$ if $\lambda_\nu = 0$, summation may be performed over all values of ν, to find

$$\begin{aligned}&2\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[K(t,x,x,D_1) - K(t,x,x,D_2)\Big] \\ &= 2\sum_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\left[\Big(\theta_\nu''\theta_\nu - b'\theta_\nu^2 - b^2\theta_\nu^2\Big) + (\theta_\nu' - b\theta_\nu)(\theta_\nu' - b\theta_\nu)\right] \\ &= 2\sum_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\left[\theta_\nu''\theta_\nu - b'\theta_\nu^2 + (\theta_\nu')^2 - 2b\theta_\nu'\theta_\nu\right] \quad .\end{aligned} \tag{5.3.28}$$

On the other hand, differentiation with respect to x yields

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - 2b\right)K(t,x,x,D_1) = \sum_\nu e^{-t\lambda_\nu}\Big(2\theta_\nu\theta_\nu' - 2b\theta_\nu^2\Big) \quad , \tag{5.3.29}$$

which implies

$$f\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}-2b\right)K(t,x,x,D_1)=2f\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[K(t,x,x,D_1)-K(t,x,x,D_2)\Big] \quad . \tag{5.3.30}$$

We now integrate this formula over M and use the boundary conditions described before, jointly with integration by parts. All boundary terms are found to vanish, so that

$$\int_M f\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}-2b\right)K(t,x,x,D_1)dx=\int_M\left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2}+2b\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right)K(t,x,x,D_1)dx$$

$$=\int_M 2f\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[K(t,x,x,D_1)-K(t,x,x,D_2)\Big] \quad . \tag{5.3.31}$$

Bearing in mind the standard notation for heat-kernel traces, Eq. (5.3.31) may be re-expressed as

$$2\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\Big(fe^{-tD_1}\Big)-\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\Big(fe^{-tD_2}\Big)\Big]$$

$$=\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\Big[\Big(f_{xx}+2bf_x\Big)e^{-tD_1}\Big] \quad , \tag{5.3.32}$$

which leads to Eq. (5.3.23) by virtue of the asymptotic expansion (5.2.6).

The algorithm resulting from Eq. (5.3.10) is sufficient to determine almost all interior terms in heat-kernel asymptotics. To appreciate this, notice that one is dealing with conformal variations which only affect the endomorphism of the operator P in (5.2.1). For example, on setting $n=2$ in Eq. (5.3.10), one ends up by studying (the tilde symbol is now used for interior terms)

$$\tilde{a}_1(1,P)\equiv\frac{1}{6}\int_M\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_1 E+\alpha_2 R\Big]=\tilde{a}_1(E,R) \quad , \tag{5.3.33}$$

which implies

$$\tilde{a}_1(1,P(0)-\varepsilon F)=\tilde{a}_1(E,R)-\tilde{a}_1(E-\varepsilon F,R)$$

$$=\frac{1}{6}\int_M\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_1(E-(E-\varepsilon F))+\alpha_2(R-R)\Big]$$

$$=\frac{1}{6}\int_M\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_1\varepsilon F) \quad , \tag{5.3.34}$$

and hence

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\tilde{a}_1(1,P(0)-\varepsilon F)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}=\frac{1}{6}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_1 F)$$

$$=\tilde{a}_0(F,P(0))=\int_M \mathrm{Tr}(F) \quad . \tag{5.3.35}$$

By comparison, Eq. (5.3.35) shows that

$$\alpha_1=6 \quad . \tag{5.3.36}$$

An analogous procedure leads to (see (5.2.20))

$$\tilde{a}_2(1,P(0)-\varepsilon F)=\tilde{a}_2\Big(E,R,\mathrm{Ric},\mathrm{Riem},\Omega\Big)-\tilde{a}_2\Big(E-\varepsilon F,R,\mathrm{Ric},\mathrm{Riem},\Omega\Big)$$

$$=\frac{1}{360}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_4 R\varepsilon F+\alpha_5(E^2-(E-\varepsilon F)^2)\Big]$$

$$=\frac{1}{360}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_4 R\varepsilon F+\alpha_5\Big(-\varepsilon^2F^2+2\varepsilon EF\Big)\Big] \quad . \tag{5.3.37}$$

Now one can apply Eq. (5.3.10) when $n=4$, to find

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\tilde{a}_2(1,P(0)-\varepsilon F)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}=\frac{1}{360}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_4 FR+2\alpha_5 FE\Big]$$

$$=\tilde{a}_1(F,P(0))=\frac{1}{6}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\alpha_1 FE+\alpha_2 FR\Big] \quad . \tag{5.3.38}$$

Equating the coefficients of the invariants occurring in Eq. (5.3.38) one finds

$$\alpha_2=\frac{1}{60}\alpha_4 \quad , \tag{5.3.39}$$

$$\alpha_5=30\alpha_1=180 \quad . \tag{5.3.40}$$

Further, the consideration of Eq. (5.3.11) when $n=2$ yields

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\tilde{a}_1\Big(e^{-2\varepsilon f}F,e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)\Big)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}=\frac{1}{6}\int_M\Bigg\{\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_1 FE)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}+2f\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_1 FE)$$

$$+\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_2 FR)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}+2f\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_2 FR)\Bigg\} \quad . \tag{5.3.41}$$

At this stage, we need the conformal variation formulae

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}E(\varepsilon)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} = -2fE + \frac{1}{2}(m-2)\Box f \quad , \tag{5.3.42}$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}R(\varepsilon)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} = -2fR - 2(m-1)\Box f \quad . \tag{5.3.43}$$

Since we are studying the case $m = n + 2 = 4$, we find

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\tilde{a}_1\Big(e^{-2\varepsilon f}F, e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)\Big)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{1}{6}\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big[(\alpha_1 - 6\alpha_2)F\Box f\Big] = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.44}$$

which implies

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{6}\alpha_1 = 1 \quad , \tag{5.3.45}$$

$$\alpha_4 = 60\alpha_2 = 60 \quad . \tag{5.3.46}$$

After considering the Laplacian acting on functions for a product manifold $M = M_1 \times M_2$, the complete set of coefficients for interior terms can be determined (Branson and Gilkey 1990):

$$\alpha_3 = 60 \ , \ \alpha_6 = 12 \ , \ \alpha_7 = 5 \ , \ \alpha_8 = -2 \ , \ \alpha_9 = 2 \ , \ \alpha_{10} = 30 \quad . \tag{5.3.47}$$

As far as interior terms are concerned, one has to use Eqs. (5.3.9) and (5.3.11), jointly with two conformal variation formulae which provide divergence terms that play an important role (Branson and Gilkey 1990):

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}a_1\Big(F, e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)\Big)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} - (m-2)a_1(fF, P(0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(m-4)\int_M \mathrm{Tr}\Big(F\Box f\Big) \quad ,\end{aligned} \tag{5.3.48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}a_2\Big(F, e^{-2\varepsilon f}P(0)\Big)\right]_{\varepsilon=0} - (m-4)a_2(fF, P(0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{360}(m-6)\int_M F\mathrm{Tr}\Big[6f^{;b}{}_{;b}{}^{a} + 10f^{;a}R \\ &+ 60f^{;a}E + 4f_{;b}R^{ab}\Big]_{;a} \quad .\end{aligned} \tag{5.3.49}$$

Equations (5.3.48) and (5.3.49) are proved for manifolds without boundary in Lemma 4.2 of Branson and Gilkey 1990. They imply that, for manifolds with boundary, the right-hand side of Eq. (5.3.48), evaluated for $F = 1$, should be added to the left-hand side of Eq. (5.3.9) when $n = 2$. Similarly, the right-hand side of Eq. (5.3.49), evaluated for $F = 1$, should be added to the left-hand side of Eq. (5.3.9) when $n = 4$. Other useful formulae involving boundary effects are (Branson and Gilkey 1990)

$$\int_M \Bigl(f_{;b} R^{ab} \Bigr)_{;a} = \int_{\partial M} \Bigl[f_{;j} \Bigl(K^{ij}{}_{|i} - ({\rm tr}K)^{|j} \Bigr) + f_{;N} R^i{}_{NiN} \Bigr] \quad , \tag{5.3.50}$$

$$f_{;i}{}^{;i} = f_{|i}{}^{|i} - ({\rm tr}K) f_{;N} \quad , \tag{5.3.51}$$

$$\int_M \Box f = - \int_{\partial M} f_{;N} \quad , \tag{5.3.52}$$

$$\int_{\partial M} \Box f = \int_{\partial M} \Bigl[f_{;NN} - ({\rm tr}K) f_{;N} \Bigr] \quad . \tag{5.3.53}$$

On taking into account Eqs. (5.3.48)–(5.3.53), the application of Eq. (5.3.9) when $n = 2, 3, 4$ leads to 18 equations which are obtained by setting to zero the coefficients multiplying

$$f_{;N} \ \ ({\rm when}\ n = 2) \quad ,$$

$$f_{;NN} \ , \ f_{;N}({\rm tr}K) \ , \ f_{;N} S \ \ ({\rm when}\ n = 3) \quad ,$$

and

$$f_{;a}{}^{;a}{}_N \ , \ f_{;N} E \ , \ f_{;N} R \ , \ f_{;N} R^i{}_{NiN} \quad ,$$

$$f_{;NN}({\rm tr}K) \ , \ f_{;N}({\rm tr}K)^2 \ , \ f_{;N} K_{ij} K^{ij} \ , \ f_{|i}({\rm tr}K)^{|i} \quad ,$$

$$f_{|i} K^{ij}{}_{|j} \ , \ f_{|i} \Omega^i{}_N \ , \ f_{;N} S({\rm tr}K) \ , \ f_{;N} S^2 \quad ,$$

$$f_{;NN} S \ , \ f_{|i}{}^{|i} \, S \ \ ({\rm when}\ n = 4) \quad .$$

The integrals of these 18 terms have a deep geometric nature in that they form a basis for the integral invariants. The resulting 18 equations are

$$-b_0(m-1) - b_1(m-2) + \frac{1}{2}b_2(m-2) - (m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.54}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}c_0(m-2) - 2c_1(m-1) + c_2(m-1) - c_6(m-3) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.55}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{2}c_0(m-2) + 2c_1(m-1) - c_2 - 2c_3(m-1) \\ &- 2c_4 - c_5(m-3) + \frac{1}{2}c_7(m-2) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.56}$$

$$-c_7(m-1) + c_8(m-2) - c_9(m-3) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.57}$$

$$-6(m-6) + \frac{1}{2}d_1(m-2) - 2d_2(m-1) - e_7(m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.58}$$

$$-60(m-6) - 2d_1 - d_5(m-1) + \frac{1}{2}d_{14}(m-2) - e_1(m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.59}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-10(m-6) - 2d_2 - d_6(m-1) \\ &+ d_9 + \frac{1}{2}d_{15}(m-2) - e_2(m-4) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.60}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-d_7(m-1) - d_8 + 2d_9 - e_3(m-4) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}d_{16}(m-2) + 4(m-6) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.61}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_5(m-2) - 2d_6(m-1) + d_7(m-1) + d_8 - e_6(m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.62}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{2}d_5(m-2) + 2d_6(m-1) - d_7 - d_9 - 3d_{10}(m-1) \\ &- 2d_{11} + \frac{1}{2}d_{17}(m-2) - e_4(m-4) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.63}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-d_8 - d_9(m-3) - d_{11}(m-1) - 3d_{12} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}d_{18}(m-2) - e_5(m-4) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.64}$$

$$d_3(m-4) - \frac{1}{2}d_5(m-2) + 2d_6(m-1) - d_7 - d_9 - 4(m-6) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.65}$$

$$d_4(m-4) - d_8 - d_9(m-3) + 4(m-6) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.66}$$

$$(m-4)d_{13} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.67}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &- \frac{1}{2}d_{14}(m-2) + 2d_{15}(m-1) - d_{16} - 2d_{17}(m-1) \\ &- 2d_{18} + d_{19}(m-2) - e_8(m-4) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.68}$$

$$-d_{19}(m-1) + \frac{3}{2}d_{20}(m-2) - e_9(m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.69}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_{14}(m-2) - 2d_{15}(m-1) + d_{16}(m-1) - e_{10}(m-4) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.70}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}d_{14}(m-2) - 2d_{15}(m-1) + d_{16} - d_{21}(m-4) = 0 \quad . \tag{5.3.71}$$

This set of algebraic equations among universal constants holds independently of the choice of Dirichlet or Robin boundary conditions. Another set of equations which hold for either Dirichlet or Robin boundary conditions is obtained by applying Eq. (5.3.11) when $n = 3, 4$. One then obtains 5 equations which result from setting to zero the coefficients multiplying

$$F_{;N}f_{;N} \ \text{ (when } n = 3) \quad ,$$

$$f_{;N}F_{;NN} \ , \ f_{;NN}F_{;N} \ , \ f_{;N}F_{;N}(\mathrm{tr}K) \ , \ f_{;N}F_{;N}S \ \text{ (when } n = 4) \quad .$$

The explicit form of these equations is (Branson and Gilkey 1990)

$$-4c_5 - 5c_6 + \frac{3}{2}c_9 = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.72}$$

$$-5e_6 - 4e_7 + 2e_{10} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.73}$$

$$2e_1 - 10e_2 + 5e_3 - 2e_7 = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.74}$$

$$-2e_1 + 10e_2 - e_3 - 10e_4 - 2e_5 - 5e_6 + 6e_7 + 2e_8 = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.75}$$

$$-5e_8 + 4e_9 - 5e_{10} = 0 \quad . \tag{5.3.76}$$

Last, one has to use the Lemma expressed by Eq. (5.3.23) when $n = 2, 3, 4$, bearing in mind that

$$E_1 \equiv E(D_1) = -b_x - b^2 \quad , \tag{5.3.77}$$

$$E_2 \equiv E(D_2) = b_x - b^2 \quad . \tag{5.3.78}$$

For example, when $n = 2$, one finds

$$a_1(f, D_1) - a_1(f, D_2) - a_0\Big(f_{xx} + 2bf_x, D_1\Big) = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.79}$$

which implies (with Dirichlet for D_1 and Robin for D_2)

$$\int_M \Big[6f(E_1 - E_2) - 6f_{xx} - 12Sf_x\Big] + \int_{\partial M} \Big[- b_2 fS - (3 + b_1)f_{;N}\Big] = 0 \quad . \tag{5.3.80}$$

The integrand of the interior term in Eq. (5.3.80) may be re-expressed as a total divergence, and hence one gets

$$\int_{\partial M} \Big[(12 - b_2)fS + (3 - b_1)f_{;N}\Big] = 0 \quad , \tag{5.3.81}$$

which leads to

$$b_1 = 3 \ , \ \ b_2 = 12 \quad . \tag{5.3.82}$$

Further details concern only the repeated application of all these algorithms, and hence we refer the reader to Branson and Gilkey 1990.

5.4 Mixed Boundary Conditions

Mixed boundary conditions occur naturally in the theory of fermionic fields, gauge fields and gravitation, in that some components of the field obey one set of boundary conditions, and the remaining part of the field obeys a complementary set of boundary conditions (Esposito et al. 1997). Here, we focus on some mathematical aspects of the problem, whereas more difficult problems are studied in

chapters 6, 9 and 10. The framework of our investigation consists, as in section 5.3, of a compact Riemannian manifold, say M, with smooth boundary ∂M. Given a vector bundle V over M, we assume that V can be decomposed as the direct sum

$$V = V_n \oplus V_d \quad , \tag{5.4.1}$$

near ∂M. The corresponding projection operators are denoted by Π_n and Π_d, respectively. On V_n one takes Neumann boundary conditions modified by some endomorphism, say S, of V_n (see (5.2.15)), while Dirichlet boundary conditions hold on V_d. The (total) boundary operator reads therefore (Gilkey 1995)

$$\mathcal{B}f \equiv \Big[\Big(\Pi_n f \Big)_{;N} + S \Pi_n f \Big]_{\partial M} \oplus \Big[\Pi_d f \Big]_{\partial M} \quad . \tag{5.4.2}$$

On defining

$$\psi \equiv \Pi_n - \Pi_d \quad , \tag{5.4.3}$$

seven new universal constants are found to contribute to heat-kernel asymptotics for an operator of Laplace type, say P. In other words, the linear combination of projectors considered in Eq. (5.4.3) gives rise to seven new invariants in the calculation of heat-kernel coefficients up to a_2: one contributes to $\tilde{a}_{3/2}(f, P, \mathcal{B})$, whereas the other six contribute to $\tilde{a}_2(f, P, \mathcal{B})$ (of course, the number of invariants is continuously increasing as one considers higher-order heat-kernel coefficients). The dependence on the boundary operator is emphasized by including it explicitly into the arguments of heat-kernel coefficients. One can thus write the general formulae (cf. (5.2.19) and (5.2.20))

$$\tilde{a}_{3/2}(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{\delta}{96} (4\pi)^{1/2} \int_{\partial M} \mathrm{Tr} \Big[\beta_1 f \psi_{|i} \, \psi^{|i} \Big] + a_{3/2}(f, P, \mathcal{B}) \quad , \tag{5.4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_2(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{360} \int_{\partial M} \mathrm{Tr} \Big[& \beta_2 f \psi \psi_{|i} \, \Omega^i{}_N + \beta_3 f \psi_{|i} \, \psi^{|i} (\mathrm{tr} K) \\ & + \beta_4 f \psi_{|i} \, \psi_{|j} K^{ij} + \beta_5 f \psi_{|i} \, \psi^{|i} S \\ & + \beta_6 f_{;N} \psi_{|i} \, \psi^{|i} + \beta_7 f \psi_{|i} \, \Omega^i{}_N \Big] + a_2(f, P, \mathcal{B}) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.5}$$

where $a_{3/2}(f,P,\mathcal{B})$ is formally analogous to Eq. (5.2.19), but with some universal constants replaced by linear functions of ψ,Π_n,Π_d, and similarly for $a_2(f,P,\mathcal{B})$ and Eq. (5.2.20). The work in Branson and Gilkey 1992b, Vassilevich 1995a and Gilkey 1995 has fixed the following values for the universal constants $\{\beta_i\}$ occurring in Eqs. (5.4.4) and (5.4.5):

$$\beta_1=-12\ ,\ \ \beta_2=60\ ,\ \ \beta_3=-12\ ,\ \ \beta_4=-24\quad , \tag{5.4.6}$$

$$\beta_5=-120\ ,\ \ \beta_6=-18\ ,\ \ \beta_7=0\quad . \tag{5.4.7}$$

To obtain this result, it is crucial to bear in mind that the correct functorial formula for the endomorphism S is

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}S(\varepsilon)\right]_{\varepsilon=0}=-fS+\frac{1}{2}(m-2)f_{;N}\Pi_n\quad . \tag{5.4.8}$$

This result was first obtained in Vassilevich 1995a, where the author pointed out that Π_n should be included, since the variation of S should compensate the one of ω_n only on the subspace V_n. The unfortunate omission of Π_n led to incorrect results in physical applications, which were later corrected in Moss and Poletti 1994, hence confirming the analytic results in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a and Esposito et al. 1994a.

There is indeed a very rich literature on the topics in spectral geometry studied in this chapter and in the previous one. In particular, further to the literature cited so far, we would like to recommend the work in Gilkey 1975, Kennedy 1978, Bérard 1986, Amsterdamski et al. 1989, Avramidi 1989, Moss and Dowker 1989, Avramidi 1990a–b, Avramidi 1991, McAvity and Osborn 1991a–b, Fursaev 1994, Alexandrov and Vassilevich 1996, Falomir et al. 1996, Branson et al. 1997.

5.5 Heat Equation and Index Theorem

Heat-kernel asymptotics makes it possible to obtain a deep and elegant formula for the index of elliptic operators. The problem is studied by many authors

(e.g. Atiyah and Patodi 1973, Gilkey 1995). Here, we follow the outline given in Atiyah 1975a.

Let P be an elliptic differential operator on a compact manifold X without boundary, and let $P^\dagger$ be its adjoint. One can then consider the two self-adjoint operators $P^\dagger P$ and $PP^\dagger$. If ϕ is any eigenfunction of $P^\dagger P$ with eigenvalue λ:

$$P^\dagger P\ \phi = \lambda\ \phi \quad , \tag{5.5.1}$$

one has, acting with P on the left:

$$(PP^\dagger)P\ \phi = \lambda\ P\phi \quad . \tag{5.5.2}$$

This means that $P\phi$ is an eigenfunction of $PP^\dagger$ with eigenvalue λ, provided that λ does not vanish. Conversely, if Φ is any eigenfunction of $PP^\dagger$ with eigenvalue λ:

$$PP^\dagger\ \Phi = \lambda\ \Phi \quad , \tag{5.5.3}$$

one finds

$$(P^\dagger P)P^\dagger\ \Phi = \lambda\ P^\dagger\Phi \quad , \tag{5.5.4}$$

i.e. $P^\dagger\Phi$ is an eigenfunction of $P^\dagger P$ with eigenvalue λ, provided that $\lambda \neq 0$. In other words, the operators $P^\dagger P$ and $PP^\dagger$ have the same non-zero eigenvalues.

The next step is the analysis of the operators $e^{-tP^\dagger P}$ and $e^{-tPP^\dagger}$. They are fundamental solutions of the corresponding heat equations (cf. Eq. (5.2.2)). For positive values of t, these have C^∞ kernels and hence are of trace class (i.e. they have finite norm). Their L^2 traces read

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\left(e^{-tP^\dagger P}\right) = \sum_\lambda e^{-t\lambda} \quad , \tag{5.5.5}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\left(e^{-tPP^\dagger}\right) = \sum_\mu e^{-t\mu} \quad , \tag{5.5.6}$$

where the summations run over the respective spectra. Thus, bearing in mind that the non-vanishing λ coincide with the non-vanishing μ, while $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to the null-space of P, and $\mu = 0$ corresponds to the null-space of $P^\dagger$, one finds

$$\text{index}(P) = \text{Tr}_{L^2}\left(e^{-tP^\dagger P}\right) - \text{Tr}_{L^2}\left(e^{-tPP^\dagger}\right) \quad . \tag{5.5.7}$$

On the other hand, it is well known from section 5.2, following the work in Minakshisundaram and Pleijel 1949 and Greiner 1971, that for any elliptic self-adjoint differential operator A of order n with non-negative spectrum, the integrated heat-kernel has an asymptotic expansion (m being the dimension of X)

$$\text{Tr}_{L^2} e^{-tA} \sim \sum_{k=-m}^{\infty} a_k \, t^{k/n} \quad . \tag{5.5.8}$$

The coefficients a_k are obtained by integrating over X a linear combination of local invariants (see (5.2.16)–(5.2.20)):

$$a_k = \int_X \alpha_k \quad . \tag{5.5.9}$$

In our case, Eqs. (5.5.7)–(5.5.9) lead to a formula of the kind

$$\text{index}(P) = \int_X (\alpha_0 - \beta_0) \quad , \tag{5.5.10}$$

where α_0 and β_0 refer to the operators $P^\dagger P$ and $PP^\dagger$, respectively. If the manifold X has a boundary, boundary terms will contribute to the index. As we know from sections 3.6 and 3.7, it is sufficient to refer to the index of the Dirac operator, say $\mathcal{D}$, which takes the general form

$$\text{index}(\mathcal{D}) = \int_X (\alpha_0 - \beta_0) + \int_{\partial X} (\gamma_0 - \delta_0) \quad , \tag{5.5.11}$$

where γ_0 and δ_0 are linear combinations of local invariants on the boundary.

5.6 Heat-Kernel and ζ-Function

If $\mathcal{A}$ is an elliptic, self-adjoint, positive-definite operator, the spectral theorem makes it possible to define its complex power $\mathcal{A}^{-s}$, where s is any complex number (Seeley 1967). The L^2 trace of the complex power of $\mathcal{A}$ is, by definition, its ζ-function:

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(s) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \mathcal{A}^{-s} \quad . \tag{5.6.1a}$$

In the literature, Eq. (5.6.1a) is frequently re-expressed in the form

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(s) = \sum_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^{-s} \quad , \tag{5.6.1b}$$

where λ runs over the (discrete) eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$, counted with their multiplicity. As it stands, this infinite sum converges if $\mathrm{Re}(s)$ is greater than a lower limit depending on the dimension m of the Riemannian manifold under consideration, and on the order n of the operator $\mathcal{A}$. Interestingly, $\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(s)$ can be analytically continued as a meromorphic function on the whole s-plane (Seeley 1967, Atiyah et al. 1976, Esposito et al. 1997), which is regular at $s = 0$. Moreover, a deep link exists between the ζ-function of $\mathcal{A}$ and its integrated heat-kernel. This is expressed by the so-called inverse Mellin transform (Hawking 1977, Gilkey 1995):

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \, \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(e^{-t\mathcal{A}} \right) dt \quad , \tag{5.6.2}$$

where Γ is the Γ-function, defined in (4.2.28). If $\mathcal{A}$ is a second-order operator, the identity (5.6.2), jointly with the asymptotic expansion

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(e^{-t\mathcal{A}} \right) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_{k/2} t^{(k-m)/2} \quad , \tag{5.6.3}$$

implies that $\zeta(0)$ takes the form

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(0) = A_{m/2} = \int_X Q_{m/2} + \int_{\partial X} S_{m/2} \quad , \tag{5.6.4}$$

where $Q_{m/2}$ and $S_{m/2}$ are linear combinations of geometric invariants. Their expression can be derived, for a given value of m, from the general method described in sections 5.2 and 5.3. In quantum field theory, Eq. (5.6.4) is found to express the conformal anomaly or the one-loop divergence (Hawking 1977, Esposito et al. 1997).

Moreover, for a given elliptic operator, say D, one can define the operators (cf. section 5.5)

$$\triangle_0 \equiv 1 + D^\dagger D \quad , \tag{5.6.5}$$

$$\triangle_1 \equiv 1 + D D^\dagger \quad , \tag{5.6.6}$$

and the ζ-functions

$$\zeta_i(s) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \triangle_i^{-s} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad . \tag{5.6.7}$$

It is then possible to prove that (Atiyah 1966)

$$\mathrm{index}(D) = \zeta_0(s) - \zeta_1(s) \quad . \tag{5.6.8}$$

Remarkably, this formula holds *for all values* of s. In particular, it is more convenient to choose $s = 0$ for the explicit calculation. The equations (5.5.11), (5.6.4) and (5.6.8) show the deep link between index theory, heat-kernels and ζ-functions.

CHAPTER SIX

NON-LOCAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS FOR MASSLESS SPIN-$\frac{1}{2}$ FIELDS

Abstract. This chapter studies the one-loop approximation for a massless spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field on a flat four-dimensional Euclidean background bounded by two concentric three-spheres, when non-local boundary conditions of the spectral type are imposed. The use of ζ-function regularization shows that the conformal anomaly vanishes, as in the case when the same field is subject to local boundary conditions involving projectors. A similar analysis of non-local boundary conditions can be performed for massless supergravity models on manifolds with boundary, to study their one-loop properties. Moreover, it is shown that the proof of self-adjointness for the boundary-value problem can be obtained by means of the limit-point criterion.

6.1 Introduction

The quantum theory of fermionic fields can be expressed, following the ideas of Feynman, in terms of amplitudes of going from suitable fermionic data on a spacelike surface $\mathcal{S}_I$, say, to fermionic data on a spacelike surface $\mathcal{S}_F$. To make sure that the quantum boundary-value problem is well posed, one has actually to consider the Euclidean formulation, where the boundary three-surfaces, Σ_I and Σ_F, say, may be regarded as (compact) Riemannian three-manifolds bounding a Riemannian four-manifold. In the case of massless spin-1/2 fields, which are the object of our investigation, one thus deals with transition amplitudes

$$\mathcal{A}[\text{boundary data}] = \int e^{-I_E} \mathcal{D}\psi \; \mathcal{D}\widetilde{\psi} \quad , \tag{6.1.1}$$

where I_E is the Euclidean action functional, and the integration is over all massless spin-1/2 fields matching the boundary data on Σ_I and Σ_F. The path-integral representation of the quantum amplitude (6.1.1) is then obtained with the help of Berezin integration rules, and one has a choice of non-local (D'Eath and Esposito 1991b) or local (D'Eath and Esposito 1991a) boundary conditions. The mathematical foundations of the former lie in the theory of spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry (Atiyah et al. 1975, Atiyah et al. 1976), and their formulation can be described as follows. In two-component spinor notation (see appendix 6.A), a massless spin-1/2 field in a four-manifold with positive-definite metric is represented by a pair $\left(\psi^A, \widetilde{\psi}_{A'}\right)$ of independent spinor fields, not related by any spinor conjugation. Suppose now that ψ^A and $\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}$ are expanded on a family of concentric three-spheres as

$$\psi^A = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tau^{-\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p,q=1}^{(n+1)(n+2)} \alpha_n^{pq} \Big[m_{np}(\tau) \rho^{nqA} + \widetilde{r}_{np}(\tau) \overline{\sigma}^{nqA} \Big] \quad , \tag{6.1.2}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}^{A'} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \tau^{-\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p,q=1}^{(n+1)(n+2)} \alpha_n^{pq} \Big[\widetilde{m}_{np}(\tau) \overline{\rho}^{nqA'} + r_{np}(\tau) \sigma^{nqA'} \Big] \quad . \tag{6.1.3}$$

With a standard notation, τ is the Euclidean-time coordinate which plays the role of a radial coordinate, and the block-diagonal matrices α_n^{pq} and the ρ- and σ-harmonics are described in detail in D'Eath and Halliwell 1987. One can now check that the harmonics ρ^{nqA} have positive eigenvalues for the intrinsic three-dimensional Dirac operator on S^3:

$$\mathcal{D}_{AB} \equiv {}_e n_{AB'} \, e_B^{\ B'j} \, {}^{(3)}D_j \quad , \tag{6.1.4}$$

and similarly for the harmonics $\sigma^{nqA'}$ and the Dirac operator

$$\mathcal{D}_{A'B'} \equiv {}_e n_{BA'} \, e_{B'}^{\ Bj} \, {}^{(3)}D_j \quad . \tag{6.1.5}$$

With our notation, ${}_e n_{AB'}$ is the Euclidean normal to the boundary, $e_B^{\ B'j}$ are the spatial components of the two-spinor version of the tetrad, and ${}^{(3)}D_j$ denotes three-dimensional covariant differentiation on S^3. By contrast, the harmonics $\overline{\sigma}^{nqA}$ and $\overline{\rho}^{nqA'}$ have negative eigenvalues for the operators (6.1.4) and (6.1.5), respectively.

The so-called *spectral* boundary conditions rely therefore on a non-local operation, i.e. the separation of the spectrum of a first-order elliptic operator (our (6.1.4) and (6.1.5)) into a positive and a negative part. They require that half of the spin-1/2 field should vanish on Σ_F, where this half is given by those modes $m_{np}(\tau)$ and $r_{np}(\tau)$ which multiply harmonics having positive eigenvalues for (6.1.4) and (6.1.5), respectively. The remaining half of the field should vanish on Σ_I, and is given by those modes $\widetilde{r}_{np}(\tau)$ and $\widetilde{m}_{np}(\tau)$ which multiply harmonics having negative eigenvalues for (6.1.4) and (6.1.5), respectively. One thus writes

$$\Big[\psi^A_{(+)}\Big]_{\Sigma_F} = 0 \Longrightarrow \Big[m_{np}\Big]_{\Sigma_F} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.1.6}$$

$$\Big[\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}_{(+)}\Big]_{\Sigma_F} = 0 \Longrightarrow \Big[r_{np}\Big]_{\Sigma_F} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.1.7}$$

and

$$\Big[\psi^A_{(-)}\Big]_{\Sigma_I} = 0 \Longrightarrow \Big[\widetilde{r}_{np}\Big]_{\Sigma_I} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.1.8}$$

$$\left[\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}_{(-)}\right]_{\Sigma_I} = 0 \Longrightarrow \left[\widetilde{m}_{np}\right]_{\Sigma_I} = 0 \quad . \tag{6.1.9}$$

Massless spin-1/2 fields are here studied since they provide an interesting example of conformally invariant field theory for which the spectral boundary conditions (6.1.6)–(6.1.9) occur naturally already at the classical level (D'Eath and Halliwell 1987).

Section 6.2 is devoted to the evaluation of the $\zeta(0)$ value resulting from the boundary conditions (6.1.6)–(6.1.9). This yields the one-loop divergence of the quantum amplitude, and coincides with the conformaly anomaly in our model. Essential self-adjointness is proved in section 6.3.

6.2 $\zeta(0)$ Value with Non-Local Boundary Conditions

As shown in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a-b, Esposito 1994a, the modes occurring in the expansions (6.1.2) and (6.1.3) obey a coupled set of equations, i.e.

$$\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} - \frac{\left(n + \frac{3}{2}\right)}{\tau} \right) x_{np} = E_{np}\, \widetilde{x}_{np} \quad , \tag{6.2.1}$$

$$\left(-\frac{d}{d\tau} - \frac{\left(n + \frac{3}{2}\right)}{\tau} \right) \widetilde{x}_{np} = E_{np}\, x_{np} \quad , \tag{6.2.2}$$

where x_{np} denotes m_{np} or r_{np}, and $\widetilde{x}_{np}$ denotes $\widetilde{m}_{np}$ or $\widetilde{r}_{np}$. Setting $E_{np} = M$ for simplicity of notation one thus finds, for all $n \geq 0$, the solutions of (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) in the form

$$m_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n}\sqrt{\tau} I_{n+1}(M\tau) + \beta_{2,n}\sqrt{\tau} K_{n+1}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{6.2.3}$$

$$r_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n}\sqrt{\tau} I_{n+1}(M\tau) + \beta_{2,n}\sqrt{\tau} K_{n+1}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{6.2.4}$$

$$\widetilde{m}_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n}\sqrt{\tau} I_{n+2}(M\tau) - \beta_{2,n}\sqrt{\tau} K_{n+2}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{6.2.5}$$

$$\widetilde{r}_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n}\sqrt{\tau} I_{n+2}(M\tau) - \beta_{2,n}\sqrt{\tau} K_{n+2}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{6.2.6}$$

where $\beta_{1,n}$ and $\beta_{2,n}$ are some constants. The insertion of (6.2.3)–(6.2.6) into the boundary conditions (6.1.6)–(6.1.9) leads to the equations (hereafter b and a are the radii of the two concentric three-sphere boundaries, with $b > a$, and we define $\beta_n \equiv \beta_{2,n}/\beta_{1,n}$)

$$I_{n+1}(Mb) + \beta_n K_{n+1}(Mb) = 0 \quad , \tag{6.2.7}$$

for m_{np} and r_{np} modes, and

$$I_{n+2}(Ma) - \beta_n K_{n+2}(Ma) = 0 \quad , \tag{6.2.8}$$

for $\widetilde{m}_{np}$ and $\widetilde{r}_{np}$ modes, with the same value of M. One thus finds two equivalent formulae for β_n:

$$\beta_n = -\frac{I_{n+1}(Mb)}{K_{n+1}(Mb)} = \frac{I_{n+2}(Ma)}{K_{n+2}(Ma)} \quad , \tag{6.2.9}$$

which lead to the eigenvalue condition

$$I_{n+1}(Mb)K_{n+2}(Ma) + I_{n+2}(Ma)K_{n+1}(Mb) = 0 \quad . \tag{6.2.10}$$

The full degeneracy is $2(n+1)(n+2)$, for all $n \geq 0$, since each set of modes contributes to (6.2.7) and (6.2.8) with degeneracy $(n+1)(n+2)$ (D'Eath and Esposito 1991b).

We can now apply ζ-function regularization to evaluate the resulting conformal anomaly, following the algorithm developed in Barvinsky et al. 1992 and applied several times in the recent literature (Esposito et al. 1997). The basic properties are as follows. Let us denote by f_n the function occurring in the equation obeyed by the eigenvalues by virtue of boundary conditions, after taking out fake roots (e.g. $x = 0$ is a fake root of order ν of the Bessel function $I_\nu(x)$). Let $d(n)$ be the degeneracy of the eigenvalues parametrized by the integer n. One can then define the function

$$I(M^2, s) \equiv \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} d(n) n^{-2s} \log f_n(M^2) \quad , \tag{6.2.11}$$

and the work in Barvinsky et al. 1992 shows that such a function admits an analytic continuation to the complex-s plane as a meromorphic function with a simple pole at $s = 0$, in the form

$$\text{“}I(M^2, s)\text{”} = \frac{I_{\rm pole}(M^2)}{s} + I^R(M^2) + {\rm O}(s) \quad . \tag{6.2.12}$$

The function $I_{\rm pole}(M^2)$ is the residue at $s = 0$, and makes it possible to obtain the $\zeta(0)$ value as

$$\zeta(0) = I_{\log} + I_{\rm pole}(M^2 = \infty) - I_{\rm pole}(M^2 = 0) \quad , \tag{6.2.13}$$

where $I_{\log}$ is the coefficient of the $\log(M)$ term in I^R as $M \to \infty$. The contributions $I_{\log}$ and $I_{\rm pole}(\infty)$ are obtained from the uniform asymptotic expansions of basis functions as $M \to \infty$ and their order $n \to \infty$ (Olver 1954), while $I_{\rm pole}(0)$ is obtained by taking the $M \to 0$ limit of the eigenvalue condition, and then studying the asymptotics as $n \to \infty$. More precisely, $I_{\rm pole}(\infty)$ coincides with the coefficient of $\frac{1}{n}$ in the expansion as $n \to \infty$ of

$$\frac{1}{2} d(n) \log\Big[\rho_\infty(n)\Big] \quad ,$$

where $\rho_\infty(n)$ is the n-dependent term in the eigenvalue condition as $M \to \infty$ and $n \to \infty$. The $I_{\rm pole}(0)$ value is instead obtained as the coefficient of $\frac{1}{n}$ in the expansion as $n \to \infty$ of

$$\frac{1}{2} d(n) \log\Big[\rho_0(n)\Big] \quad ,$$

where $\rho_0(n)$ is the n-dependent term in the eigenvalue condition as $M \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$ (Barvinsky et al. 1992, Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1992).

In our problem, using the limiting form of Bessel functions when the argument tends to zero, one finds that the left-hand side of Eq. (6.2.10) is proportional to M^{-1} as $M \to 0$. Hence one has to multiply by M to get rid of fake roots. Moreover, in the uniform asymptotic expansion of Bessel functions as $M \to \infty$ and $n \to \infty$,

both I and K functions contribute a $\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}}$ factor. These properties imply that $I_{\log}$ vanishes:

$$I_{\log} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2l(l+1) \Big(1 - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \Big) = 0 \quad . \tag{6.2.14}$$

Moreover,

$$I_{\rm pole}(\infty) = 0 \quad , \tag{6.2.15}$$

since there is no n-dependent coefficient in the uniform asymptotic expansion of Eq. (6.2.10). Last, one finds

$$I_{\rm pole}(0) = 0 \quad , \tag{6.2.16}$$

since the limiting form of Eq. (6.2.10) as $M \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$ is

$$\frac{2}{Ma} (b/a)^{n+1} \quad .$$

The results (6.2.14)–(6.2.16), jointly with the general formula (6.2.13), lead to a vanishing value of the one-loop divergence:

$$\zeta(0) = 0 \quad . \tag{6.2.17}$$

Our detailed calculation shows that, in flat Euclidean four-space, the conformal anomaly for a massless spin-1/2 field subject to non-local boundary conditions of the spectral type on two concentric three-spheres vanishes, as in the case when the same field is subject to the local boundary conditions

$$\sqrt{2}\ {}_e n_A{}^{A'}\ \psi^A = \pm \widetilde{\psi}^{A'} \quad \text{on } \Sigma_I \text{ and } \Sigma_F \quad . \tag{6.2.18}$$

If Eq. (6.2.18) holds and the spin-1/2 field is massless, the work in Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1994 shows in fact that $\zeta(0) = 0$.

Backgrounds given by flat Euclidean four-space bounded by two concentric three-spheres are not the ones occurring in the Hartle-Hawking proposal for quantum cosmology, where the initial three-surface Σ_I shrinks to a point (Hartle and Hawking 1983, Hawking 1984). Nevertheless, they are relevant for the quantization programme of gauge fields and gravitation in the presence of boundaries

(Esposito et al. 1997). In particular, similar techniques have been used in section 5 of Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996 to study a two-boundary problem for simple supergravity subject to spectral boundary conditions in the axial gauge. One then finds the eigenvalue condition

$$I_{n+2}(Mb)K_{n+3}(Ma)+I_{n+3}(Ma)K_{n+2}(Mb)=0 \quad , \tag{6.2.19}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. The analysis of Eq. (6.2.19) along the same lines of what we have done for Eq. (6.2.10) shows that three-dimensional transverse-traceless gravitino modes yield a vanishing contribution to $\zeta(0)$, unlike three-dimensional transverse-traceless modes for gravitons, which instead contribute -5 to $\zeta(0)$ (Esposito et al. 1994b).

Thus, the results in Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996 seem to show that, at least in finite regions bounded by one three-sphere or two concentric three-spheres, simple supergravity is not one-loop finite in the presence of boundaries. Of course, more work is in order to check this property, and then compare it with the finiteness of scattering problems suggested in D'Eath 1996. Further progress is thus likely to occur by virtue of the fertile interplay of geometric and analytic techniques in the investigation of heat-kernel asymptotics and (one-loop) quantum cosmology.

6.3 Self-Adjointness

This section is devoted to the mathematical foundations of the one-loop analysis described so far. We shall see that the boundary conditions are enough to determine a real and positive spectrum for the squared Dirac operator (from which the $\zeta(0)$ value can be evaluated as we just did).

We here consider the portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by a three-sphere of radius a. On inserting the expansions (6.1.2) and (6.1.3) into the massless spin-1/2 action

$$I_E=\frac{i}{2}\int_M\left[\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}\left(\nabla_{AA'}\psi^A\right)-\left(\nabla_{AA'}\,\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}\right)\psi^A\right]\sqrt{\det\,g}\;d^4x \quad , \tag{6.3.1}$$

and studying the spin-1/2 eigenvalue equations, one finds that the modes obey the second-order differential equations

$$P_n \widetilde{m}_{np} = P_n \widetilde{m}_{n,p+1} = P_n \widetilde{r}_{np} = P_n \widetilde{r}_{n,p+1} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.3.2}$$

$$Q_n r_{np} = Q_n r_{n,p+1} = Q_n m_{np} = Q_n m_{n,p+1} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.3.3}$$

where

$$P_n \equiv \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \left[E_n^2 - \frac{((n+2)^2 - \frac{1}{4})}{\tau^2} \right] \quad , \tag{6.3.4}$$

$$Q_n \equiv \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \left[E_n^2 - \frac{((n+1)^2 - \frac{1}{4})}{\tau^2} \right] \quad , \tag{6.3.5}$$

and E_n are the eigenvalues of the mode-by-mode form of the Dirac operator (Esposito 1994a).

The spectral boundary conditions (6.1.6)–(6.1.9) imply that, in our case,

$$m_{np}(a) = 0 \quad , \tag{6.3.6}$$

$$r_{np}(a) = 0 \quad . \tag{6.3.7}$$

Thus, one studies the one-dimensional operators Q_n defined in (6.3.5), and the eigenmodes are requested to be regular at the origin, and to obey (6.3.6) and (6.3.7) on S^3. For this purpose, it is convenient to consider, for all $n = 0, 1, 2, ...$, the differential operators

$$\widetilde{Q}_n \equiv -\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \frac{((n+1)^2 - \frac{1}{4})}{\tau^2} \quad , \tag{6.3.8}$$

with domain given by the functions u in $AC^2[0, a]$ such that $u(a) = 0$. These are particular cases of a large class of operators considered in the literature. They can be studied by using the following definitions and theorems from Reed and Simon 1975 (cf. Chernoff 1977, Weidmann 1980):

Definition 6.3.1. The function V is in the *limit circle* case at zero if for some, and therefore all λ, *all* solutions of the equation

$$-\varphi''(x) + V(x)\varphi(x) = \lambda\varphi(x) \tag{6.3.9}$$

are square integrable at zero.

Definition 6.3.2. If $V(x)$ is not in the limit circle case at zero, it is said to be in the *limit point* case at zero.

Theorem 6.3.1. Let V be continuous and *positive* near zero. If $V(x) \geq \frac{3}{4}x^{-2}$ near zero, then $\mathcal{O}$ is in the limit point case at zero.

When $V(x)$ takes the form $\frac{c}{x^2}$ for $c > 0$, theorem 6.3.1 can be proved as follows (Reed and Simon 1975). The equation

$$-\varphi''(x) + \frac{c}{x^2}\varphi(x) = 0 \tag{6.3.10}$$

admits solutions of the form x^α, where α takes the values

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1+4c} \quad , \tag{6.3.11}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1+4c} \quad . \tag{6.3.12}$$

When $\alpha = \alpha_1$ the solution is obviously square integrable at zero. However, when $\alpha = \alpha_2$, the solution is square integrable at zero if and only if $\alpha_2 > -\frac{1}{2}$, which implies $c < \frac{3}{4}$. By virtue of definitions 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, this means that $V(x)$ is in the limit point at zero if and only if $c \geq \frac{3}{4}$.

The operator $\widetilde{Q}_n$ obeys the limit point condition at $\tau = 0$, as we have just proved, and the limit circle condition at $\tau = a$. These properties, jointly with the homogeneous Dirichlet condition at $\tau = a$, are sufficient to obtain a self-adjoint boundary-value problem. The calculation of conformal anomalies for massless spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fields on flat Euclidean manifolds with boundary, initiated in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a–b and confirmed in Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1992–1993, has

led over the last few years to a substantial improvement of the understanding of one-loop divergences in quantum field theory. Various independent techniques, which often rely on the structures applied in the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ analysis, have been used to deal with the whole set of perturbative modes for Euclidean Maxwell theory and Euclidean quantum gravity (Esposito 1994a–b; Esposito et al. 1994a–b, 1995a–b; Esposito et al. 1997). Nevertheless, a systematic analysis aimed at explaining why the various $\zeta(0)$ values are well defined was still lacking in the literature.

Our investigation, which relies in part on Esposito et al. 1996, represents the first step in this direction, in the case of the squared Dirac operator with the spectral boundary conditions (6.1.6)–(6.1.9). Note that such non-local boundary conditions play a crucial role in our proof, and that the extension to the local boundary conditions studied in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a (see section 10.3) remains the main open problem in our investigation. For this purpose, the calculation of deficiency indices (Reed and Simon 1975) appears more appropriate. This would complete the analysis in Esposito 1994a, Esposito 1995, where the existence of self-adjoint extensions is proved by showing that a linear, anti-involutory operator F exists which is norm-preserving, commutes with the Dirac operator $\mathcal{D}$ and maps the domain of $\mathcal{D}$ into itself.

Moreover, it remains to be seen how to apply similar techniques to the analysis of higher-spin fields. These are gauge fields and gravitation, which obey a complicated set of mixed boundary conditions (Esposito et al. 1997). The mixed nature of the boundary conditions results from the request of their invariance under infinitesimal gauge transformations. In particular, for the gravitational field, at least five different sets of mixed boundary conditions have been proposed in the literature (Barvinsky 1987, Luckock and Moss 1989, Luckock 1991, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1995, Marachevsky and Vassilevich 1996, Moss and Silva 1997). If this investigation could be completed, it would put on solid ground the current work on trace anomalies and one-loop divergences on manifolds with boundary, and it would add evidence in favour of quantum cosmology being at the very heart

of many exciting developments in quantum field theory, analysis and differential geometry (Esposito et al. 1997).

6.A Appendix

Two-component spinor calculus is a powerful tool for studying classical field theories in four-dimensional space-time models. Within this framework, the basic object is spin-space, a two-dimensional complex vector space S with a symplectic form ε, i.e. an antisymmetric complex bilinear form. Unprimed spinor indices $A, B, ...$ take the values $0, 1$ whereas primed spinor indices $A', B', ...$ take the values $0', 1'$ since there are actually two such spaces: unprimed spin-space (S, ε) and primed spin-space (S', ε'). The whole two-spinor calculus in *Lorentzian* four-manifolds relies on three fundamental properties (Penrose and Rindler 1984, Ward and Wells 1990)

(i) The isomorphism between $\left(S, \varepsilon_{AB}\right)$ and its dual $\left(S^*, \varepsilon^{AB}\right)$. This is provided by the symplectic form ε, which raises and lowers indices according to the rules

$$\varepsilon^{AB} \, \varphi_B = \varphi^A \ \in \ S \quad , \tag{6.A.1}$$

$$\varphi^B \, \varepsilon_{BA} = \varphi_A \ \in \ S^* \quad . \tag{6.A.2}$$

Thus, since

$$\varepsilon_{AB} = \varepsilon^{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{6.A.3}$$

one finds in components $\varphi^0 = \varphi_1, \varphi^1 = -\varphi_0$.

Similarly, one has the isomorphism $\left(S', \varepsilon_{A'B'}\right) \cong \left((S')^*, \varepsilon^{A'B'}\right)$, which implies

$$\varepsilon^{A'B'} \, \varphi_{B'} = \varphi^{A'} \ \in \ S' \quad , \tag{6.A.4}$$

$$\varphi^{B'} \, \varepsilon_{B'A'} = \varphi_{A'} \ \in \ (S')^* \quad , \tag{6.A.5}$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{A'B'} = \varepsilon^{A'B'} = \begin{pmatrix} 0' & 1' \\ -1' & 0' \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{6.A.6}$$

(ii) The anti-isomorphism between $\left(S, \varepsilon_{AB}\right)$ and $\left(S', \varepsilon_{A'B'}\right)$, called complex conjugation, and denoted by an overbar. According to a standard convention, one has

$$\overline{\psi^A} \equiv \overline{\psi}^{A'} \in S' \quad , \tag{6.A.7}$$

$$\overline{\psi^{A'}} \equiv \overline{\psi}^{A} \in S \quad . \tag{6.A.8}$$

Thus, complex conjugation maps elements of a spin-space to elements of the *complementary* spin-space. Hence we say that it is an anti-isomorphism (Stewart 1991). In components, if w^A is viewed as $w^A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$, the action of (6.A.7) leads to

$$\overline{w^A} \equiv \overline{w}^{A'} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\alpha} \\ \overline{\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{6.A.9}$$

whereas, if $z^{A'} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \delta \end{pmatrix}$, then (6.A.8) leads to

$$\overline{z^{A'}} \equiv \overline{z}^{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\gamma} \\ \overline{\delta} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{6.A.10}$$

With our notation, $\overline{\alpha}$ denotes complex conjugation of the function α, and so on. Note that the symplectic structure is preserved by complex conjugation, since $\overline{\varepsilon}_{A'B'} = \varepsilon_{A'B'}$.

(iii) The isomorphism between the tangent space T at a point of space-time and the tensor product of the unprimed spin-space $\left(S, \varepsilon_{AB}\right)$ and the primed spin-space $\left(S', \varepsilon_{A'B'}\right)$:

$$T \cong \left(S, \varepsilon_{AB}\right) \otimes \left(S', \varepsilon_{A'B'}\right) \quad . \tag{6.A.11}$$

The Infeld-van der Waerden symbols $\sigma^a{}_{AA'}$ and $\sigma_a{}^{AA'}$ express this isomorphism, and the correspondence between a vector v^a and a spinor $v^{AA'}$ is given by

$$v^{AA'} \equiv v^a \, \sigma_a{}^{AA'} \quad , \tag{6.A.12}$$

$$v^a \equiv v^{AA'} \, \sigma^a{}_{AA'} \quad . \tag{6.A.13}$$

These mixed spinor-tensor symbols obey the identities (Ward and Wells 1990)

$$\overline{\sigma}_a{}^{AA'} = \sigma_a{}^{AA'} \quad , \tag{6.A.14}$$

$$\sigma_a{}^{AA'} \, \sigma^b{}_{AA'} = \delta_a{}^b \quad , \tag{6.A.15}$$

$$\sigma_a{}^{AA'} \, \sigma^a{}_{BB'} = \varepsilon_B{}^A \, \varepsilon_{B'}{}^{A'} \quad , \tag{6.A.16}$$

$$\sigma_{[a}{}^{AA'} \, \sigma_{b]A}{}^{B'} = -\frac{i}{2} \, \varepsilon_{abcd} \, \sigma^{cAA'} \, \sigma^d{}_A{}^{B'} \quad . \tag{6.A.17}$$

Similarly, a one-form ω_a has a spinor equivalent

$$\omega_{AA'} \equiv \omega_a \, \sigma^a{}_{AA'} \quad , \tag{6.A.18}$$

whereas the spinor equivalent of the metric is

$$\eta_{ab} \, \sigma^a{}_{AA'} \, \sigma^b{}_{BB'} \equiv \varepsilon_{AB} \, \varepsilon_{A'B'} \quad . \tag{6.A.19}$$

In particular, in Minkowski space-time Eqs. (6.A.12) and (6.A.17) enable one to write down a coordinate system in 2×2 matrix form

$$x^{AA'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} x^0 + x^3 & x^1 - ix^2 \\ x^1 + ix^2 & x^0 - x^3 \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{6.A.20}$$

In the Lorentzian-signature case, the Maxwell two-form $F \equiv F_{ab} dx^a \wedge dx^b$ can be written spinorially (Ward and Wells 1990) as

$$F_{AA'BB'} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(F_{AA'BB'} - F_{BB'AA'}\Big) = \varphi_{AB} \, \varepsilon_{A'B'} + \varphi_{A'B'} \, \varepsilon_{AB} \quad , \tag{6.A.21}$$

where

$$\varphi_{AB} \equiv \frac{1}{2} F_{AC'B}{}^{C'} = \varphi_{(AB)} \quad , \tag{6.A.22}$$

$$\varphi_{A'B'} \equiv \frac{1}{2} F_{CB'}{}^{C}{}_{A'} = \varphi_{(A'B')} \quad . \tag{6.A.23}$$

These formulae are obtained by applying the identity

$$T_{AB} - T_{BA} = \varepsilon_{AB}\, T_C{}^C \tag{6.A.24}$$

to express $\frac{1}{2}\Big(F_{AA'BB'} - F_{AB'BA'}\Big)$ and $\frac{1}{2}\Big(F_{AB'BA'} - F_{BB'AA'}\Big)$. Note also that round brackets (AB) denote (as usual) symmetrization over the spinor indices A and B, and that the antisymmetric part of φ_{AB} vanishes by virtue of the antisymmetry of F_{ab}, since (Ward and Wells 1990) $\varphi_{[AB]} = \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{AB}\; F_{CC'}{}^{CC'} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{AB}\; \eta^{cd}\; F_{cd} = 0$. Last, but not least, in the Lorentzian case

$$\overline{\varphi_{AB}} \equiv \overline{\varphi}_{A'B'} = \varphi_{A'B'} \quad . \tag{6.A.25}$$

The symmetric spinor fields φ_{AB} and $\varphi_{A'B'}$ are the anti-self-dual and self-dual parts of the gauge curvature two-form, respectively.

Similarly, the Weyl curvature $C^a{}_{bcd}$, i.e. the part of the Riemann curvature tensor invariant under conformal rescalings of the metric, may be expressed spinorially, omitting soldering forms (see below) for simplicity of notation, as

$$C_{abcd} = \psi_{ABCD}\; \varepsilon_{A'B'}\; \varepsilon_{C'D'} + \overline{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}\; \varepsilon_{AB}\; \varepsilon_{CD} \quad . \tag{6.A.26}$$

It should be emphasized that it is exactly the omission of soldering forms that makes it possible to achieve the most transparent translation of tensor fields into their spinor equivalent.

In canonical gravity, two-component spinors lead to a considerable simplification of calculations. Denoting by n^μ the future-pointing unit timelike normal to a spacelike three-surface, its spinor version obeys the relations

$$n_{AA'}\; e^{AA'}_{\;\;i} = 0 \quad , \tag{6.A.27}$$

$$n_{AA'} \, n^{AA'} = 1 \quad , \tag{6.A.28}$$

where $e^{AA'}_{\mu} \equiv e^{a}_{\mu} \, \sigma_{a}^{AA'}$ is the two-spinor version of the tetrad, often referred to in the literature as soldering form (Ashtekar 1988). Denoting by h the induced metric on the three-surface, other useful relations are (D'Eath 1984, Esposito 1994a)

$$h_{ij} = -e_{AA'i} \, e^{AA'}_{j} \quad , \tag{6.A.29}$$

$$e^{AA'}_{0} = N \, n^{AA'} + N^{i} \, e^{AA'}_{i} \quad , \tag{6.A.30}$$

$$n_{AA'} \, n^{BA'} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{A}^{B} \quad , \tag{6.A.31}$$

$$n_{AA'} \, n^{AB'} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{A'}^{B'} \quad , \tag{6.A.32}$$

$$n_{[EB'} \, n_{A]A'} = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{EA} \, \varepsilon_{B'A'} \quad , \tag{6.A.33}$$

$$e_{AA'j} \, e^{AB'}_{k} = -\frac{1}{2} h_{jk} \, \varepsilon_{A'}^{B'} - i \varepsilon_{jkl} \sqrt{\det h} \, n_{AA'} \, e^{AB'l} \quad . \tag{6.A.34}$$

In Eq. (6.A.30), N and N^{i} are the lapse and shift functions respectively (Esposito 1994a).

To obtain the space-time curvature, we first need to define the spinor covariant derivative $\nabla_{AA'}$. If θ, ϕ, ψ are spinor fields, $\nabla_{AA'}$ is a map such that (Penrose and Rindler 1984, Stewart 1991)

(1) $\nabla_{AA'}(\theta + \phi) = \nabla_{AA'}\theta + \nabla_{AA'}\phi$ (i.e. linearity).

(2) $\nabla_{AA'}(\theta\psi) = \Big(\nabla_{AA'}\theta\Big)\psi + \theta\Big(\nabla_{AA'}\psi\Big)$ (i.e. Leibniz rule).

(3) $\psi = \nabla_{AA'}\theta$ implies $\overline{\psi} = \nabla_{AA'}\overline{\theta}$ (i.e. reality condition).

(4) $\nabla_{AA'}\varepsilon_{BC} = \nabla_{AA'}\varepsilon^{BC} = 0$, i.e. the symplectic form may be used to raise or lower indices within spinor expressions acted upon by $\nabla_{AA'}$, in addition to the usual metricity condition $\nabla g = 0$, which involves instead the product of two ε-symbols.

(5) $\nabla_{AA'}$ commutes with any index substitution not involving A, A'.

(6) For any function f, one finds $\Big(\nabla_a \nabla_b - \nabla_b \nabla_a\Big) f = 2 S_{ab}{}^{c}\ \nabla_c f$, where $S_{ab}{}^{c}$ is the torsion tensor.

(7) For any derivation D acting on spinor fields, a spinor field $\xi^{AA'}$ exists such that $D\psi = \xi^{AA'}\ \nabla_{AA'}\psi, \forall \psi$.

As proved in Penrose and Rindler 1984, such a spinor covariant derivative exists and is unique.

If Lorentzian space-time is replaced by a complex or real Riemannian four-manifold, an important modification should be made, since the anti-isomorphism between unprimed and primed spin-space no longer exists. This means that primed spinors can no longer be regarded as complex conjugates of unprimed spinors, or viceversa, as in (6.A.7) and (6.A.8). In particular, Eqs. (6.A.21) and (6.A.26) should be re-written as

$$F_{AA'BB'} = \varphi_{AB}\ \varepsilon_{A'B'} + \widetilde{\varphi}_{A'B'}\ \varepsilon_{AB} \quad , \tag{6.A.35}$$

$$C_{abcd} = \psi_{ABCD}\ \varepsilon_{A'B'}\ \varepsilon_{C'D'} + \widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}\ \varepsilon_{AB}\ \varepsilon_{CD} \quad . \tag{6.A.36}$$

With our notation, $\varphi_{AB}, \widetilde{\varphi}_{A'B'}$, as well as $\psi_{ABCD}, \widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}$ are *completely independent* symmetric spinor fields, not related by any conjugation.

Indeed, a conjugation can still be defined in the real Riemannian case, but it no longer relates $\Big(S, \varepsilon_{AB}\Big)$ to $\Big(S', \varepsilon_{A'B'}\Big)$. It is instead an anti-involutory operation which maps elements of a spin-space (either unprimed or primed) to elements of the *same* spin-space. By anti-involutory we mean that, when applied twice to a spinor with an odd number of indices, it yields the same spinor with the opposite sign, i.e. its square is minus the identity, whereas the square of complex conjugation as defined in (6.A.9) and (6.A.10) equals the identity. Following Woodhouse 1985 and Esposito 1994a, Euclidean conjugation, denoted by a *dagger*, is defined as follows:

$$\Big(w^A\Big)^{\dagger} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\beta} \\ -\overline{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{6.A.37}$$

$$\left(z^{A'}\right)^{\dagger} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{\delta} \\ \overline{\gamma} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{6.A.38}$$

This means that, in flat Euclidean four-space, a unit 2×2 matrix $\delta_{BA'}$ exists such that

$$\left(w^{A}\right)^{\dagger} \equiv \varepsilon^{AB}\, \delta_{BA'}\, \overline{w}^{A'} \quad . \tag{6.A.39}$$

We are here using the freedom to regard w^A either as an $SL(2,C)$ spinor for which complex conjugation can be defined, or as an $SU(2)$ spinor for which Euclidean conjugation is instead available. The soldering forms for $SU(2)$ spinors only involve spinor indices of the same spin-space, i.e. $\widetilde{e}_i{}^{AB}$ and $\widetilde{e}_i{}^{A'B'}$ (cf. Ashtekar 1991). More precisely, denoting by E^i_a a real *triad*, where $i = 1, 2, 3$, and by $\tau^a{}_A{}^B$ the three Pauli matrices obeying the identity

$$\tau^a{}_A{}^B\, \tau^b{}_B{}^D = i\, \varepsilon^{abc}\, \tau_{cA}{}^D + \delta^{ab}\, \delta_A{}^D \quad , \tag{6.A.40}$$

the $SU(2)$ soldering forms are defined by

$$\widetilde{e}^j{}_A{}^B \equiv -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\, E^j_a\, \tau^a{}_A{}^B \quad . \tag{6.A.41}$$

Note that our conventions differ from the ones in Ashtekar 1991, i.e. we use $\widetilde{e}$ instead of σ, and a, b for Pauli-matrix indices, i, j for tangent-space indices on a three-manifold Σ, to agree with our previous notation. The soldering form in (6.A.41) provides an isomorphism between the three-real-dimensional tangent space at each point of Σ, and the three-real-dimensional vector space of 2×2 trace-free Hermitian matrices. The Riemannian three-metric on Σ is then given by

$$h^{ij} = -\widetilde{e}^i{}_A{}^B\, \widetilde{e}^j{}_B{}^A \quad . \tag{6.A.42}$$

CHAPTER SEVEN

MASSLESS SPIN-$\frac{3}{2}$ POTENTIALS

Abstract. This chapter studies the two-spinor form of the Rarita-Schwinger potentials subject to local boundary conditions compatible with local supersymmetry. The massless Rarita-Schwinger field equations are studied in four-real-dimensional Riemannian backgrounds with boundary. Gauge transformations on the potentials are shown to be compatible with the field equations providing the background is Ricci-flat, in agreement with previous results in the literature. However, the preservation of boundary conditions under such gauge transformations leads to a restriction of the gauge freedom. The recent construction by Penrose of a second set of potentials which supplement the Rarita-Schwinger potentials is then applied. The equations for these potentials, jointly with the boundary conditions, imply that the background four-geometry is further restricted to be totally flat. The analysis of other gauge transformations confirms that, in the massless case, the only admissible class of Riemannian backgrounds with boundary is totally flat.

7.1 Introduction

Over the last few years, much effort has been made to study locally supersymmetric boundary conditions in perturbative quantum cosmology (Luckock and Moss 1989, Luckock 1991, D'Eath and Esposito 1991a, Esposito 1994a-b, Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1993, Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1994, Esposito et al. 1997). The aim of this chapter is to perform a complete analysis of the corresponding *classical* elliptic boundary-value problems. Indeed, in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994 it was shown that one possible set of local boundary conditions for a massless field of spin s, involving field strengths $\phi_{A...L}$ and $\widetilde{\phi}_{A'...L'}$ and the Euclidean normal ${}_{e}n^{AA'}$ to the boundary:

$$2^{s}\ {}_{e}n^{AA'}...{}_{e}n^{LL'}\ \phi_{A...L} = \pm\ \widetilde{\phi}^{A'...L'} \quad \text{at} \quad \partial M \quad , \tag{7.1.1}$$

can only be imposed in flat Euclidean backgrounds with boundary. However, such boundary conditions [motivated by supergravity theories in anti-de Sitter spacetime (Breitenlohner and Freedman 1982, Hawking 1983), where (7.1.1) is essential to obtain a well-defined quantum theory after taking the covering space of anti-de Sitter] do not make it possible to relate bosonic and fermionic fields through the action of complementary projection operators at the boundary (Luckock 1991). For this purpose, one has to impose another set of local and supersymmetric boundary conditions, first proposed in Luckock and Moss 1989. These are in general *mixed*, and involve in particular Dirichlet conditions for the transverse modes of the vector potential of electromagnetism, a mixture of Dirichlet and Neumann conditions for scalar fields, and local boundary conditions for the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field and the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential. Using two-component spinor notation for supergravity (D'Eath 1984, Esposito 1995, D'Eath 1996), the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ boundary conditions relevant for quantum cosmology take the form (Esposito 1994a)

$$\sqrt{2}\ {}_{e}n_{A}{}^{A'}\ \psi^{A}{}_{i} = \pm\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}_{i} \quad \text{at} \quad \partial M \quad . \tag{7.1.2}$$

With our notation, $\left(\psi^{A}_{i}, \widetilde{\psi}^{A'}_{i}\right)$ are the *independent* (i.e. not related by any conjugation) spatial components (hence $i = 1, 2, 3$) of the spinor-valued one-forms appearing in the action functional of Euclidean supergravity (D'Eath 1996).

In the light of the results outlined so far, a naturally occurring question is whether an analysis motivated by the one in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994 can be used to derive restrictions on the classical boundary-value problem corresponding to (7.1.2). Such a question is of crucial importance for at least two reasons:

(i) In the absence of boundaries, extended supergravity theories are naturally formulated on curved backgrounds with a cosmological constant (Breitenlohner and Freedman 1982, Hawking 1983). Thus, if a local theory in terms of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials and in the presence of boundaries can only be studied in flat Euclidean four-space, this result would make it impossible to consider the most interesting supergravity models when a four-manifold with boundaries occurs.

(ii) One of the main problems of the twistor programme for general relativity lies in the impossibility of achieving a twistorial reconstruction of (complex) vacuum space-times which are not right-flat (i.e. such that the Ricci spinor $R_{AA'BB'}$ and the self-dual Weyl spinor $\widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}$ vanish). To overcome this difficulty, Penrose has proposed a new definition of twistors as charges for massless spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ fields in Ricci-flat Riemannian manifolds (Penrose 1994, Esposito 1995). However, since gravitino potentials have been studied also in backgrounds which are not Ricci-flat, one is led to ask whether the recent Penrose formalism can be applied to the analysis of a larger class of Riemannian four-manifolds with boundary.

For this purpose, we introduce in section 7.2 the Rarita-Schwinger potentials with their gauge transformations in Riemannian background four-geometries. Section 7.3 derives compatibility conditions from the gauge transformations of section 7.2, and from the boundary conditions (7.1.2). Section 7.4 is devoted to the potentials which supplement the Rarita-Schwinger potentials in Ricci-flat backgrounds. Section 7.5 studies other sets of gauge transformations. Concluding remarks and

open problems are presented in section 7.6. Relevant details about the two-spinor form of Rarita-Schwinger equations are given in the appendix.

7.2 Rarita-Schwinger Potentials

For the reasons described in the introduction, we are here interested in the independent spatial components $\left(\psi^{A}_{\ i}, \widetilde{\psi}^{A'}_{i}\right)$ of the gravitino field in Riemannian backgrounds. In terms of the spatial components $e_{AB'i}$ of the tetrad, and of spinor fields, they can be expressed as (Aichelburg and Urbantke 1981, D'Eath 1984, Penrose 1991)

$$\psi_{A\,i} = \Gamma^{C'}_{\ AB}\ e^{B}_{\ C'i} \quad , \tag{7.2.1}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{A'\,i} = \gamma^{C}_{\ A'B'}\ e_{C}^{\ B'}_{\ \ i} \quad . \tag{7.2.2}$$

A first important difference with respect to the Dirac form of the potentials studied in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994 is that the spinor fields $\Gamma^{C'}_{\ AB}$ and $\gamma^{C}_{\ A'B'}$ are no longer symmetric in the second and third index. From now on, they will be referred to as spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials. They obey the differential equations (see appendix and cf. Rarita and Schwinger 1941, Aichelburg and Urbantke 1981, Penrose 1991)

$$\varepsilon^{B'C'}\ \nabla_{A(A'}\ \gamma^{A}_{\ B')C'} = -3\Lambda\ \widetilde{\alpha}_{A'} \quad , \tag{7.2.3}$$

$$\nabla^{B'(B}\ \gamma^{A)}_{\ \ B'C'} = \Phi^{ABL'}_{\ \ \ C'}\ \widetilde{\alpha}_{L'} \quad , \tag{7.2.4}$$

$$\varepsilon^{BC}\ \nabla_{A'(A}\ \Gamma^{A'}_{\ B)C} = -3\Lambda\ \alpha_{A} \quad , \tag{7.2.5}$$

$$\nabla^{B(B'}\ \Gamma^{A')}_{\ \ BC} = \widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'L}_{\ \ \ \ C}\ \alpha_{L} \quad , \tag{7.2.6}$$

where $\nabla_{AB'}$ is the spinor covariant derivative corresponding to the curved connection ∇ of the background, the spinors $\Phi^{AB}_{\ \ C'D'}$ and $\widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'}_{\ \ \ CD}$ correspond to the trace-free part of the Ricci tensor, the scalar Λ corresponds to the scalar curvature $R = 24\Lambda$ of the background, and $\alpha_{A}, \widetilde{\alpha}_{A'}$ are a pair of independent spinor

fields, corresponding to the Majorana field in the Lorentzian regime. Moreover, the potentials are subject to the gauge transformations (cf. section 7.5)

$$\widehat{\gamma}^{A}{}_{B'C'} \equiv \gamma^{A}{}_{B'C'} + \nabla^{A}{}_{B'}\, \lambda_{C'} \quad , \tag{7.2.7}$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{A'}{}_{BC} \equiv \Gamma^{A'}{}_{BC} + \nabla^{A'}_{B}\, \nu_{C} \quad . \tag{7.2.8}$$

A second important difference with respect to the Dirac potentials is that the spinor fields ν_B and $\lambda_{B'}$ are no longer taken to be solutions of the Weyl equation. They should be freely specifiable (see section 7.3).

7.3 Compatibility Conditions

Our task is now to derive compatibility conditions, by requiring that the field equations (7.2.3)–(7.2.6) should also be satisfied by the gauge-transformed potentials appearing on the left-hand side of Eqs. (7.2.7)–(7.2.8). For this purpose, after defining the operators

$$\Box_{AB} \equiv \nabla_{M'(A}\, \nabla_{B)}{}^{M'} \quad , \tag{7.3.1}$$

$$\Box_{A'B'} \equiv \nabla_{F(A'}\, \nabla_{B')}{}^{F} \quad , \tag{7.3.2}$$

we need the standard identity $\Omega_{[AB]} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{AB}\, \Omega_{C}{}^{C}$ and the spinor Ricci identities

$$\Box_{AB}\, \nu_{C} = \psi_{ABCD}\, \nu^{D} - 2\Lambda\, \nu_{(A}\, \varepsilon_{B)C} \quad , \tag{7.3.3}$$

$$\Box_{A'B'} \lambda_{C'} = \widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}\, \lambda^{D'} - 2\Lambda\, \lambda_{(A'}\, \varepsilon_{B')C'} \quad , \tag{7.3.4}$$

$$\Box^{AB}\, \lambda_{B'} = \Phi^{AB}{}_{M'B'}\, \lambda^{M'} \quad , \tag{7.3.5}$$

$$\Box^{A'B'}\, \nu_{B} = \widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'}{}_{MB}\, \nu^{M} \quad . \tag{7.3.6}$$

Of course, $\widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}$ and ψ_{ABCD} are the self-dual and anti-self-dual Weyl spinors respectively.

Thus, on using the Eqs. (7.2.3)–(7.2.8) and (7.3.1)–(7.3.6), the basic rules of two-spinor calculus (Penrose and Rindler 1986, Ward and Wells 1990, Stewart 1991, Esposito 1995) lead to the compatibility equations

$$3\Lambda \, \lambda_{A'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.3.7}$$

$$\Phi^{AB}{}_{M'}{}^{C'} \, \lambda^{M'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.3.8}$$

$$3\Lambda \, \nu_A = 0 \quad , \tag{7.3.9}$$

$$\widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'}{}_{M}{}^{C} \, \nu^{M} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.3.10}$$

Non-trivial solutions of (7.3.7)–(7.3.10) only exist if the scalar curvature and the trace-free part of the Ricci tensor vanish. Hence the gauge transformations (7.2.7) and (7.2.8) lead to spinor fields ν_A and $\lambda_{A'}$ which are freely specifiable *inside* Ricci-flat backgrounds, while the boundary conditions (7.1.2) are preserved under the action of (7.2.7) and (7.2.8) provided that the following conditions hold at the boundary:

$$\sqrt{2} \, {}_e n_A{}^{A'} \left(\nabla^{AC'} \, \nu^B \right) e_{BC'i} = \pm \left(\nabla^{CA'} \lambda^{B'} \right) e_{CB'i} \quad \text{at} \quad \partial M \quad . \tag{7.3.11}$$

7.4 Second Set of Potentials in Ricci-Flat Backgrounds

As shown by Penrose (1994), in a Ricci-flat manifold the Rarita-Schwinger potentials may be supplemented by secondary potentials. Here we use such a construction in its local form. For this purpose, we introduce a second set of potentials for spin $\frac{3}{2}$ by requiring that locally (see Penrose 1994)

$$\gamma_{A'B'}{}^{C} \equiv \nabla_{BB'} \, \rho_{A'}{}^{CB} \quad . \tag{7.4.1}$$

Of course, special attention should be payed to the index ordering in (7.4.1), since the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials are not symmetric. On inserting (7.4.1) into (7.2.3), a

repeated use of symmetrizations and anti-symmetrizations leads to the equation (hereafter $\Box \equiv \nabla_{CF'}\nabla^{CF'}$)

$$\varepsilon_{FL}\,\nabla_{AA'}\,\nabla^{B'(F}\,\rho_{B'}{}^{A)L} + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^{A}{}_{A'}\,\nabla^{B'M}\,\rho_{B'(AM)}$$

$$+\,\Box_{AM}\,\rho_{A'}{}^{(AM)} + \frac{3}{8}\Box\rho_{A'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.2}$$

where, following Penrose 1994, we have defined

$$\rho_{A'} \equiv \rho_{A'C}{}^{C} \quad , \tag{7.4.3}$$

and we bear in mind that our background has to be Ricci-flat. Thus, if the following equation holds (cf. Penrose 1994):

$$\nabla^{B'(F}\,\rho_{B'}{}^{A)L} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.4}$$

one finds

$$\nabla^{B'M}\,\rho_{B'(AM)} = \frac{3}{2}\,\nabla_{A}{}^{F'}\,\rho_{F'} \quad , \tag{7.4.5}$$

and hence Eq. (7.4.2) may be cast in the form

$$\Box_{AM}\,\rho_{A'}{}^{(AM)} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.4.6}$$

On the other hand, a very useful identity resulting from Eq. (4.9.13) of Penrose and Rindler 1984 enables one to show that

$$\Box_{AM}\,\rho_{A'}{}^{(AM)} = -\Phi_{AMA'}{}^{L'}\,\rho_{L'}{}^{(AM)} \quad . \tag{7.4.7}$$

Hence Eq. (7.4.6) reduces to an identity by virtue of Ricci-flatness. Moreover, we have to insert (7.4.1) into the field equation (7.2.4) for γ-potentials. By virtue of Eq. (7.4.4) and of the identities (cf. Penrose and Rindler 1984)

$$\Box^{BM}\,\rho_{B'}{}^{A}{}_{M} = -\psi^{ABLM}\,\rho_{(LM)B'} - \Phi^{BM}{}_{B'}{}^{D'}\,\rho^{A}{}_{MD'} + 4\Lambda\,\rho^{(AB)}{}_{B'} \, , \tag{7.4.8}$$

$$\Box^{B'F'}\,\rho_{B'}{}^{(AB)} = 3\Lambda\,\rho^{(AB)F'} + \widetilde{\Phi}^{B'F'}{}_{L}{}^{A}\,\rho^{(LB)}{}_{B'} + \widetilde{\Phi}^{B'F'B}{}_{L}\,\rho^{(AL)}{}_{B'} \, , \tag{7.4.9}$$

this leads to the equation

$$\psi^{ABLM}\ \rho_{(LM)C'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.10}$$

where we have again used the Ricci-flatness condition.

Of course, potentials supplementing the Γ-potentials may also be constructed locally. On defining (cf. (7.4.1))

$$\Gamma_{AB}{}^{C'} \equiv \nabla_{B'B}\ \theta_{A}{}^{C'B'} \quad , \tag{7.4.11}$$

$$\theta_A \equiv \theta_{AC'}{}^{C'} \quad , \tag{7.4.12}$$

and requiring that (Penrose 1994, Esposito 1995)

$$\nabla^{B(F'}\ \theta_{B}{}^{A')L'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.13}$$

one finds

$$\nabla^{BM'}\ \theta_{B(A'M')} = \frac{3}{2}\nabla_{A'}{}^{F}\ \theta_F \quad , \tag{7.4.14}$$

and a similar calculation yields an identity and the equation

$$\widetilde{\psi}^{A'B'L'M'}\ \theta_{(L'M')C} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.4.15}$$

Note that Eqs. (7.4.10) and (7.4.15) relate explicitly the second set of potentials to the curvature of the background. This inconsistency is avoided if one of the following conditions holds:

(i) The whole conformal curvature of the background vanishes.

(ii) ψ^{ABLM} and $\theta_{(L'M')C}$, or $\widetilde{\psi}^{A'B'L'M'}$ and $\rho_{(LM)C'}$, vanish.

(iii) The symmetric parts of the ρ- and θ-potentials vanish.

In the first case one finds that the only admissible background is again flat Euclidean four-space with boundary, as in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994. By contrast,

in the other cases, left-flat, right-flat or Ricci-flat backgrounds are still admissible, provided that the ρ- and θ-potentials take the form

$$\rho_{A'}{}^{CB} = \varepsilon^{CB}\ \widetilde{\alpha}_{A'} \quad , \tag{7.4.16}$$

$$\theta_{A}{}^{C'B'} = \varepsilon^{C'B'}\ \alpha_{A} \quad , \tag{7.4.17}$$

where α_A and $\widetilde{\alpha}_{A'}$ solve the Weyl equations

$$\nabla^{AA'}\ \alpha_A = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.18}$$

$$\nabla^{AA'}\ \widetilde{\alpha}_{A'} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.4.19}$$

Eqs. (7.4.16)–(7.4.19) ensure also the validity of Eqs. (7.4.4), (7.4.13), jointly with (7.A.6) and (7.A.7) of the appendix.

However, if one requires the preservation of Eqs. (7.4.4) and (7.4.13) under the following gauge transformations for ρ- and θ-potentials (the order of the indices AL, $A'L'$ is of crucial importance):

$$\widehat{\rho}_{B'}{}^{AL} \equiv \rho_{B'}{}^{AL} + \nabla_{B'}{}^{A}\ \mu^{L} \quad , \tag{7.4.20}$$

$$\widehat{\theta}_{B}{}^{A'L'} \equiv \theta_{B}{}^{A'L'} + \nabla_{B}{}^{A'}\ \sigma^{L'} \quad , \tag{7.4.21}$$

one finds compatibility conditions in Ricci-flat backgrounds of the form

$$\psi_{AFLD}\ \mu^{D} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.4.22}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{A'F'L'D'}\ \sigma^{D'} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.4.23}$$

Thus, to ensure *unrestricted* gauge freedom (except at the boundary) for the second set of potentials, one is forced to work with flat Euclidean backgrounds. The boundary conditions (7.1.2) play a role in this respect, since they make it necessary to consider both ψ_i^A and $\widetilde{\psi}_i^{A'}$, and hence both $\rho_{B'}{}^{AL}$ and $\theta_{B}{}^{A'L'}$. Otherwise, one might use Eq. (7.4.22) to set to zero the anti-self-dual Weyl spinor only, *or* Eq. (7.4.23) to set to zero the self-dual Weyl spinor only, so that self-dual (left-flat) or anti-self-dual (right-flat) Riemannian backgrounds with boundary would survive.

7.5 Other Gauge Transformations

In the massless case, flat Euclidean backgrounds with boundary are really the only possible choice for spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials with a gauge freedom. To prove this, we have also investigated an alternative set of gauge transformations for spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials, written in the form (cf. (7.2.7) and (7.2.8))

$$\widehat{\gamma}^{A}{}_{B'C'} \equiv \gamma^{A}{}_{B'C'} + \nabla^{A}{}_{C'}\ \lambda_{B'} \quad , \tag{7.5.1}$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{A'}{}_{BC} \equiv \Gamma^{A'}{}_{BC} + \nabla^{A'}{}_{C}\ \nu_{B} \quad . \tag{7.5.2}$$

These gauge transformations *do not* correspond to the usual formulation of the Rarita-Schwinger system, but we will see that they can be interpreted in terms of familiar physical concepts.

On imposing that the field equations (7.2.3)–(7.2.6) should be preserved under the action of (7.5.1) and (7.5.2), and setting to zero the trace-free part of the Ricci spinor (since it is inconsistent to have gauge fields $\lambda_{B'}$ and ν_B which depend explicitly on the curvature of the background) one finds compatibility conditions in the form of differential equations, i.e. (cf. Esposito 1995)

$$\Box\lambda_{B'} = -2\Lambda\ \lambda_{B'} \quad , \tag{7.5.3}$$

$$\nabla^{(A(B'}\ \nabla^{C')B)}\lambda_{B'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.4}$$

$$\Box\nu_{B} = -2\Lambda\ \nu_{B} \quad , \tag{7.5.5}$$

$$\nabla^{(A'(B}\ \nabla^{C)B')}\ \nu_{B} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.5.6}$$

In a flat Riemannian four-manifold with flat connection D, covariant derivatives commute and $\Lambda = 0$. Hence it is possible to express $\lambda_{B'}$ and ν_B as solutions of the Weyl equations

$$D^{AB'}\ \lambda_{B'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.7}$$

$$D^{BA'}\ \nu_{B} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.8}$$

which agree with the flat-space version of (7.5.3)–(7.5.6). The boundary conditions (7.1.2) are then preserved under the action of (7.5.1) and (7.5.2) if ν_B and $\lambda_{B'}$ obey the boundary conditions (cf. (7.3.11))

$$\sqrt{2}\ {}_e n_A{}^{A'} \Big(D^{BC'}\ \nu^A \Big) e_{BC'i} = \pm \Big(D^{CB'}\ \lambda^{A'} \Big) e_{CB'i} \quad \text{at} \quad \partial M \quad . \tag{7.5.9}$$

In the curved case, on defining

$$\phi^A \equiv \nabla^{AA'}\ \lambda_{A'} \quad , \tag{7.5.10}$$

$$\widetilde{\phi}^{A'} \equiv \nabla^{AA'}\ \nu_A \quad , \tag{7.5.11}$$

equations (7.5.4) and (7.5.6) imply that these spinor fields solve the equations (cf. Esposito 1995)

$$\nabla_{C'}{}^{(A}\ \phi^{B)} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.12}$$

$$\nabla_C{}^{(A'}\ \widetilde{\phi}^{B')} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.5.13}$$

Moreover, Eqs. (7.5.3), (7.5.5) and the spinor Ricci identities imply that

$$\nabla_{AB'}\ \phi^A = 2\Lambda\ \lambda_{B'} \quad , \tag{7.5.14}$$

$$\nabla_{BA'}\ \widetilde{\phi}^{A'} = 2\Lambda\ \nu_B \quad . \tag{7.5.15}$$

Remarkably, the Eqs. (7.5.12) and (7.5.13) are the twistor equations (Penrose and Rindler 1986) in Riemannian four-geometries. The consistency conditions for the existence of non-trivial solutions of such equations in curved four-manifolds are given by (Penrose and Rindler 1986)

$$\psi_{ABCD} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.16}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'} = 0 \quad , \tag{7.5.17}$$

respectively, unless one regards ϕ^B as a four-fold principal spinor of ψ_{ABCD}, and $\widetilde{\phi}^{B'}$ as a four-fold principal spinor of $\widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}$.

Further consistency conditions for our problem are derived by acting with covariant differentiation on the twistor equation, i.e.

$$\nabla_{A'}{}^{C} \, \nabla^{AA'} \, \phi^{B} + \nabla_{A'}{}^{C} \, \nabla^{BA'} \, \phi^{A} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.5.18}$$

While the complete symmetrization in ABC yields Eq. (7.5.16), the use of Eq. (7.5.18), jointly with the spinor Ricci identities of section 7.3, yields

$$\Box \phi^{B} = 2\Lambda \, \phi^{B} \quad , \tag{7.5.19}$$

and an analogous equation is found for $\widetilde{\phi}^{B'}$. Thus, since Eq. (7.5.12) implies

$$\nabla_{C'}{}^{A} \, \phi^{B} = \varepsilon^{AB} \, \pi_{C'} \quad , \tag{7.5.20}$$

we may obtain from (7.5.20) the equation

$$\nabla^{BA'} \, \pi_{A'} = 2\Lambda \, \phi^{B} \quad , \tag{7.5.21}$$

by virtue of the spinor Ricci identities and of Eq. (7.5.19). On the other hand, in the light of (7.5.20), Eq. (7.5.14) leads to

$$\nabla_{AB'} \, \phi^{A} = 2\pi_{B'} = 2\Lambda \, \lambda_{B'} \quad . \tag{7.5.22}$$

Hence $\pi_{A'} = \Lambda \, \lambda_{A'}$, and the definition (7.5.10) yields

$$\nabla^{BA'} \, \pi_{A'} = \Lambda \, \phi^{B} \quad . \tag{7.5.23}$$

By comparison of Eqs. (7.5.21) and (7.5.23), one gets the equation $\Lambda \, \phi^{B} = 0$. If $\Lambda \neq 0$, this implies that ϕ^{B}, $\pi_{B'}$ and $\lambda_{B'}$ have to vanish, and there is no gauge freedom fou our model. This inconsistency is avoided if and only if $\Lambda = 0$, and the corresponding background is forced to be totally flat, since we have already set to zero the trace-free part of the Ricci spinor and the whole conformal curvature. The same argument applies to $\widetilde{\phi}^{B'}$ and the gauge field ν_{B}. The present analysis corrects the statements made in section 8.8 of Esposito 1995, where it was not realized that, in our massless model, a non-vanishing cosmological constant is

incompatible with a gauge freedom for the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential. More precisely, if one sets $\Lambda = 0$ from the beginning in Eqs. (7.5.3) and (7.5.5), the system (7.5.3)–(7.5.6) admits solutions of the Weyl equation in Ricci-flat manifolds. These backgrounds are further restricted to be totally flat on considering the Eqs. (7.4.10) and (7.4.15) for an arbitrary form of the ρ- and θ-potentials. As already pointed out at the end of section 7.4, the boundary conditions (7.1.2) play a role, since otherwise one might focus on right-flat or left-flat Riemannian backgrounds with boundary.

Yet other gauge transformations can be studied (e.g. the ones involving gauge fields $\lambda_{B'}$ and ν_B which solve the twistor equations), but they are all incompatible with a non-vanishing cosmological constant in the massless case.

7.6 Concluding Remarks

The consideration of boundary conditions is essential for obtaining a well-defined formulation of physical theories in quantum cosmology (Hartle and Hawking 1983, Hawking 1984). In particular, one-loop quantum cosmology (Esposito 1994a, Esposito et al. 1997) makes it necessary to study spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials about four-dimensional Riemannian backgrounds with boundary. The corresponding classical analysis has been performed in our chapter in the massless case, to supersede the analysis appearing in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994. Our results are as follows.

First, the gauge transformations (7.2.7) and (7.2.8) are compatible with the massless Rarita-Schwinger equations provided that the background four-geometry is Ricci-flat (Deser and Zumino 1976). However, the presence of a boundary restricts the gauge freedom, since the boundary conditions (7.1.2) are preserved under the action of (7.2.7) and (7.2.8) only if the boundary conditions (7.3.11) hold.

Second, the Penrose construction of a second set of potentials in Ricci-flat four-manifolds shows that the admissible backgrounds may be further restricted to

be totally flat, or left-flat, or right-flat, unless these potentials take the special form (7.4.16) and (7.4.17). Hence the potentials supplementing the Rarita-Schwinger potentials have a very clear physical meaning in Ricci-flat four-geometries with boundary: they are related to the spinor fields $\left(\alpha_A, \widetilde{\alpha}_{A'}\right)$ corresponding to the Majorana field in the Lorentzian version of Eqs. (7.2.3)–(7.2.6). (One should bear in mind that, in real Riemannian four-manifolds, the only admissible spinor conjugation is Euclidean conjugation, which is anti-involutory on spinor fields with an odd number of indices (Woodhouse 1985, Esposito 1995). Hence no Majorana field can be defined in real Riemannian four-geometries.)

Third, to ensure unrestricted gauge freedom for the ρ- and θ-potentials, one is forced to work with flat Euclidean backgrounds, when the boundary conditions (7.1.2) are imposed. Thus, the very restrictive results obtained in Esposito and Pollifrone 1994 for massless Dirac potentials with the boundary conditions (7.1.1) are indeed confirmed also for massless Rarita-Schwinger potentials subject to the supersymmetric boundary conditions (7.1.2). Interestingly, a formalism originally motivated by twistor theory (Penrose and Rindler 1986, Ward and Wells 1990, Esposito 1995) has been applied to classical boundary-value problems relevant for one-loop quantum cosmology.

Fourth, the gauge transformations (7.5.1) and (7.5.2) with non-trivial gauge fields are compatible with the field equations (7.2.3)–(7.2.6) if and only if the background is totally flat. The corresponding gauge fields solve the Weyl equations (7.5.7) and (7.5.8), subject to the boundary conditions (7.5.9). Indeed, it is well known that the Rarita-Schwinger description of a massless spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ field is equivalent to the Dirac description in a special choice of gauge (Penrose 1994). In such a gauge, the spinor fields $\lambda_{B'}$ and ν_B solve the Weyl equations, and this is exactly what we find in section 7.5 on choosing the gauge transformations (7.5.1) and (7.5.2).

A non-vanishing cosmological constant can be consistently studied when a *massive* spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential is studied (Townsend 1977). For this purpose, one has to replace the spinor covariant derivative $\nabla_{AA'}$ in the field equations (7.2.3)–(7.2.6)

by a new spinor covariant derivative $S_{AA'}$ which reduces to $\nabla_{AA'}$ when $\Lambda = 0$. In the language of γ-matrices, one has (cf. Townsend 1977)

$$S_{\mu} \equiv \nabla_{\mu} + f(\Lambda)\gamma_{\mu} \quad , \tag{7.6.1}$$

where $f(\Lambda)$ vanishes at $\Lambda = 0$, and γ_{μ} are the γ-matrices. The following chapter studies the reformulation of sections 7.2–7.5 in terms of the definition (7.6.1).

Moreover, other interesting problems are found to arise:

(i) Can one relate Eqs. (7.4.4) and (7.4.13) to the theory of integrability conditions relevant for massless fields in curved backgrounds (see Penrose 1994 and our appendix) ? What happens when such equations do not hold ?

(ii) Is there an underlying global theory of Rarita-Schwinger potentials ? In the affirmative case, what are the key features of the global theory ?

(iii) Can one reconstruct the Riemannian four-geometry from the twistor space in Ricci-flat or conformally flat backgrounds with boundary, or from whatever is going to replace twistor space ?

Thus, the results and problems presented in our chapter seem to add evidence in favour of a deep link existing between twistor geometry, quantum cosmology and modern field theory.

7.A Appendix

Following Aichelburg and Urbantke 1981, one can locally express the Γ-potentials of (7.2.1) as (cf. (7.4.11))

$$\Gamma^{A}{}_{BB'} \equiv \nabla_{BB'}\, \alpha^{A} \quad . \tag{7.A.1}$$

Thus, acting with $\nabla_{CC'}$ on both sides of (7.A.1), symmetrizing over $C'B'$ and using the spinor Ricci identity (7.3.6), one finds

$$\nabla_{C(C'}\, \Gamma^{AC}{}_{B')} = \widetilde{\Phi}_{B'C'L}{}^{A}\, \alpha^{L} \quad . \tag{7.A.2}$$

Moreover, acting with $\nabla_C{}^{C'}$ on both sides of (7.A.1), putting $B' = C'$ (with contraction over this index), and using the spinor Ricci identity (7.3.3) leads to

$$\varepsilon^{AB}\,\nabla_{(C}{}^{C'}\,\Gamma_{|A|B)C'} = -3\Lambda\,\alpha_C \quad . \tag{7.A.3}$$

Eqs. (7.A.1)–(7.A.3) rely on the conventions in Aichelburg and Urbantke 1981. However, to achieve agreement with the conventions in Penrose 1994 and in our book, Eqs. (7.2.3)–(7.2.6) are obtained by defining (for the effect of torsion terms, see comments following Eq. (21) in Aichelburg and Urbantke 1981)

$$\Gamma_B{}^A{}_{B'} \equiv \nabla_{BB'}\,\alpha^A \quad , \tag{7.A.4}$$

$$\gamma_{A'}{}^{B'}{}_C \equiv \nabla_{CA'}\,\widetilde{\alpha}^{B'} \quad . \tag{7.A.5}$$

On requiring that (7.A.5) and (7.4.1) should agree, one finds by comparison that

$$\nabla_{BB'}\,\rho_{A'}{}^{(CB)} = 2\nabla^C{}_{[A'}\,\widetilde{\alpha}_{B']} \quad , \tag{7.A.6}$$

which is obviously satisfied if $\rho_{A'}{}^{(CB)} = 0$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}_{B'}$ obeys the Weyl equation (7.4.19). Similarly, by comparison of (7.A.4) and (7.4.11) one finds

$$\nabla_{B'B}\,\theta_A{}^{(C'B')} = 2\nabla^{C'}{}_{[A}\,\alpha_{B]} \quad , \tag{7.A.7}$$

which is satisfied if Eqs. (7.4.17) and (7.4.18) hold.

In the original approach by Penrose (1994), one describes Rarita-Schwinger potentials in flat space-time in terms of a rank-three vector bundle with local coordinates $\Big(\eta_A, \zeta\Big)$, and an operator $\Omega_{AA'}$ whose action is defined by

$$\Omega_{AA'}(\eta_B, \zeta) \equiv \Big(\mathcal{D}_{AA'}\eta_B, \mathcal{D}_{AA'}\zeta - \eta^C\rho_{A'AC}\Big) \quad , \tag{7.A.8}$$

$\mathcal{D}$ being the flat Levi-Civita connection of Minkowski space-time. The gauge transformations are then

$$\Big(\widehat{\eta}_B, \widehat{\zeta}\Big) \equiv \Big(\eta_B, \zeta + \eta_A\xi^A\Big) \quad , \tag{7.A.9}$$

$$\widehat{\rho}_{A'AB} \equiv \rho_{A'AB} + \mathcal{D}_{AA'}\xi_B \quad . \tag{7.A.10}$$

For the operator defined in (7.A.8), the integrability condition on β-planes turns out to be

$$\mathcal{D}^{A'(A}\,\rho_{A'}{}^{B)C} = 0 \quad . \tag{7.A.11}$$

CHAPTER EIGHT

MASSIVE SPIN-$\frac{3}{2}$ POTENTIALS

Abstract. The two-component spinor form of massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials in conformally flat Einstein four-manifolds is studied. Following earlier work in the literature, a non-vanishing cosmological constant makes it necessary to introduce a supercovariant derivative operator. The analysis of supergauge transformations of potentials for spin $\frac{3}{2}$ shows that the gauge freedom for massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials is generated by solutions of the supertwistor equations. The supercovariant form of a partial connection on a non-linear bundle is then obtained, and the basic equation of massive secondary potentials is shown to be the integrability condition on super β-surfaces of a differential operator on a vector bundle of rank three.

8.1 Introduction

The local theory of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials in real Riemannian four-geometries is receiving careful consideration in the current literature. As we know from chapter seven, there are a number of deep motivations for this analysis. In Minkowski space-time, twistors arise naturally as charges for massless spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ fields (Penrose 1991, Esposito 1995). In Ricci-flat four-manifolds (Deser and Zumino 1976) such fields are well defined (Ricci-flatness being a necessary and sufficient consistency condition), and a suitable generalization of the concept of twistors would make it possible to reconstruct solutions of the vacuum Einstein equations from the resulting twistor space. In extended supergravity theories, however, it is necessary to consider massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ fields in Riemannian backgrounds. For this purpose, a careful spinorial analysis of the problem is in order.

We have thus studied massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials in four-manifolds with non-vanishing cosmological constant, considering the supercovariant derivative compatible with a non-vanishing scalar curvature. This is the content of section 8.2. Section 8.3 studies the gauge freedom of the second kind, which is generated by a particular type of twistors, i.e. the Euclidean Killing spinors. Section 8.4 studies the preservation of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ field equations under the supergauge transformations of Rarita-Schwinger potentials. Section 8.5 studies the second set of potentials for spin $\frac{3}{2}$ in the massive case. In section 8.6, a partial superconnection acting on a bundle with non-linear fibres is introduced. Section 8.7 studies the action of a superconnection on a vector bundle of rank three, and the corresponding integrability condition on super β-surfaces is derived. Results and open problems are described in section 8.8.

8.2 The Superconnection

In the massless case, the two-spinor form of the Rarita-Schwinger equations is the one given in chapter 7, where $\nabla_{AA'}$ is the spinor covariant derivative corresponding to the connection ∇ of the background. In the massive case, however, the appropriate connection, hereafter denoted by S, has an additional term which couples to the cosmological constant $\lambda = 6\Lambda$. In the language of γ-matrices, the new covariant derivative S_μ to be inserted *in the field equations* (Townsend 1977) takes the form

$$S_\mu \equiv \nabla_\mu + f(\Lambda)\gamma_\mu \quad , \tag{8.2.1}$$

where $f(\Lambda)$ vanishes at $\Lambda = 0$, and γ_μ are the curved-space γ-matrices. Since, following Esposito and Pollifrone 1996, we are interested in the two-spinor formulation of the problem, we have to bear in mind the action of γ-matrices on any spinor $\varphi \equiv \left(\beta^C, \widetilde{\beta}_{C'}\right)$. Note that unprimed and primed spin-spaces are no longer (anti-)isomorphic in the case of positive-definite four-metrics, since there is no complex conjugation which turns primed spinors into unprimed spinors, or the other way around (Penrose and Rindler 1986, Esposito 1995). Hence β^C and $\widetilde{\beta}_{C'}$ are totally unrelated. With this understanding, we write the supergauge transformations for massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials in the form (cf. (7.2.7) and (7.2.8))

$$\widehat{\gamma}^A{}_{B'C'} \equiv \gamma^A{}_{B'C'} + S^A{}_{B'}\ \lambda_{C'} \quad , \tag{8.2.2}$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{A'}{}_{BC} \equiv \Gamma^{A'}{}_{BC} + S^{A'}{}_{B}\ \nu_C \quad , \tag{8.2.3}$$

where the action of $S_{AA'}$ on the gauge fields $\left(\nu^B, \lambda_{B'}\right)$ is defined by (cf. (8.2.1))

$$S_{AA'}\ \nu_B \equiv \nabla_{AA'}\ \nu_B + f_1(\Lambda)\varepsilon_{AB}\ \lambda_{A'} \quad , \tag{8.2.4}$$

$$S_{AA'}\ \lambda_{B'} \equiv \nabla_{AA'}\ \lambda_{B'} + f_2(\Lambda)\varepsilon_{A'B'}\ \nu_A \quad . \tag{8.2.5}$$

With our notation, $R = 24\Lambda$ is the scalar curvature, f_1 and f_2 are two functions which vanish at $\Lambda = 0$, whose form will be determined later by a geometric analysis.

The action of $S_{AA'}$ on a many-index spinor $T^{A\ldots L}_{B'\ldots F'}$ can be obtained by expanding such a T as a sum of products of spin-vectors, i.e. (Penrose and Rindler 1984)

$$T^{A\ldots L}_{B'\ldots F'} = \sum_i \alpha^A_{(i)}\ldots\beta^L_{(i)}\ \gamma^{(i)}_{B'}\ldots\delta^{(i)}_{F'} \quad , \tag{8.2.6}$$

and then applying the Leibniz rule and the definitions (8.2.4) and (8.2.5), where $\alpha^A_{(i)}$ has an independent partner $\widetilde{\alpha}^{A'}_{(i)}$, ... , $\gamma^{(i)}_{B'}$ has an independent partner $\widetilde{\gamma}^{(i)}_{B}$, ... , and so on. Thus, one has for example

$$\Big(S_{AA'} - \nabla_{AA'}\Big)\, T_{BCE'} = \sum_i \Big[f_1 \varepsilon_{AB}\ \widetilde{\alpha}^{(i)}_{A'}\ \beta^{(i)}_C\ \gamma^{(i)}_{E'} + f_1 \varepsilon_{AC}\ \alpha^{(i)}_B\ \widetilde{\beta}^{(i)}_{A'}\ \gamma^{(i)}_{E'}$$

$$+ f_2 \varepsilon_{A'E'}\ \alpha^{(i)}_B\ \beta^{(i)}_C\ \widetilde{\gamma}^{(i)}_A \Big] \quad . \tag{8.2.7}$$

A further requirement is that $S_{AA'}$ should annihilate the curved ε-spinors. Hence in our analysis we always assume that

$$S_{AA'}\ \varepsilon_{BC} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.2.8}$$

$$S_{AA'}\ \varepsilon_{B'C'} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.2.9}$$

In the light of the definitions and assumptions presented so far, one can write the Rarita-Schwinger equations with non-vanishing cosmological constant $\lambda = 6\Lambda$, i.e.

$$\varepsilon^{B'C'}\ S_{A(A'}\ \gamma^{A}{}_{B')C'} = \Lambda\ \widetilde{F}_{A'} \quad , \tag{8.2.10}$$

$$S^{B'(B}\ \gamma^{A)}{}_{B'C'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.2.11}$$

$$\varepsilon^{BC}\ S_{A'(A}\ \Gamma^{A'}{}_{B)C} = \Lambda\ F_A \quad , \tag{8.2.12}$$

$$S^{B(B'}\ \Gamma^{A')}{}_{BC} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.2.13}$$

With our notation, F_A and $\widetilde{F}_{A'}$ are spinor fields proportional to the traces of the second set of potentials for spin $\frac{3}{2}$. These will be studied in section 8.5.

8.3 Gauge Freedom of the Second Kind

The gauge freedom of the second kind is the one which does not affect the potentials after a gauge transformation. This requirement corresponds to the case analyzed in Siklos 1985, where it is pointed out that, while the Lagrangian of $N = 1$ supergravity is invariant under gauge transformations with arbitrary spinor fields $\left(\nu^A, \lambda_{A'}\right)$, the actual *solutions* are only invariant if the supercovariant derivatives (8.2.4) and (8.2.5) vanish.

On setting to zero $S_{AA'}\ \nu_B$ and $S_{AA'}\ \lambda_{B'}$, one gets a coupled set of equations which are the Euclidean version of the Killing-spinor equation (Siklos 1985), i.e.

$$\nabla^{A'}{}_B\ \nu_C = -f_1(\Lambda)\lambda^{A'}\ \varepsilon_{BC} \quad , \tag{8.3.1}$$

$$\nabla^{A}{}_{B'}\ \lambda_{C'} = -f_2(\Lambda)\nu^{A}\ \varepsilon_{B'C'} \quad . \tag{8.3.2}$$

What is peculiar of Eqs. (8.3.1) and (8.3.2) is that their right-hand sides involve spinor fields which are, themselves, solutions of the twistor equation. Hence one deals with a special type of twistors, which do not exist in a generic curved manifold. Equation (8.3.1) can be solved for $\lambda^{A'}$ as

$$\lambda_{C'} = \frac{1}{2f_1(\Lambda)}\nabla_{C'}{}^{B}\ \nu_B \quad . \tag{8.3.3}$$

The insertion of (8.3.3) into Eq. (8.3.2) and the use of spinor Ricci identities (see (7.3.3)–(7.3.6)) yields the second-order equation

$$\Box\nu_A + (6\Lambda + 8f_1 f_2)\nu_A = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.4}$$

On the other hand, Eq. (8.3.1) implies the twistor equation

$$\nabla^{A'}{}_{(B}\ \nu_{C)} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.5}$$

Covariant differentiation of Eq. (8.3.5), jointly with spinor Ricci identities, leads to

$$\Box\nu_A - 2\Lambda\nu_A = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.6}$$

By comparison of Eqs. (8.3.4) and (8.3.6) one finds the condition $f_1 f_2 = -\Lambda$. The integrability condition of Eq. (8.3.5) is given by (Penrose and Rindler 1986)

$$\psi_{ABCD}\, \nu^D = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.7}$$

This means that our manifold is conformally left-flat, unless ν^D is a four-fold principal spinor of the anti-self-dual Weyl spinor. The latter possibility is here ruled out, *to avoid having gauge fields related explicitly to the curvature of the background*.

The condition $f_1 f_2 = -\Lambda$ is also obtained by comparison of first-order equations, since for example

$$\nabla^{AA'}\, \nu_A = 2 f_1 \lambda^{A'} = -2 \frac{\Lambda}{f_2} \lambda^{A'} \quad . \tag{8.3.8}$$

The first equality in (8.3.8) results from Eq. (8.3.1), while the second one is obtained since the twistor equations also imply that (see Eq. (8.3.2))

$$\nabla^{AA'} \Big(- f_2 \nu_A \Big) = 2\Lambda\, \lambda^{A'} \quad . \tag{8.3.9}$$

Entirely analogous results are obtained on considering the twistor equation resulting from Eq. (8.3.2), i.e.

$$\nabla^{A}{}_{(B'}\, \lambda_{C')} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.10}$$

The integrability condition of Eq. (8.3.10) is

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{A'B'C'D'}\, \lambda^{D'} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.3.11}$$

Since our gauge fields cannot be four-fold principal spinors of the Weyl spinor (cf. Lewandowski 1991), Eqs. (8.3.7) and (8.3.11) imply that our background geometry is conformally flat.

8.4 Compatibility Conditions

We now require that the field equations (8.2.10)–(8.2.13) should be preserved under the action of the supergauge transformations (8.2.2) and (8.2.3). This is the procedure one follows in the massless case, and is a milder requirement with respect to the analysis of section 8.3.

If ν^B and $\lambda_{B'}$ are twistors, but not necessarily Killing spinors, they obey the Eqs. (8.3.5) and (8.3.10), which imply that, for some independent spinor fields π^A and $\widetilde{\pi}^{A'}$, one has

$$\nabla^{A'}{}_B \, \nu_C = \varepsilon_{BC} \, \widetilde{\pi}^{A'} \quad , \tag{8.4.1}$$

$$\nabla^{A}{}_{B'} \, \lambda_{C'} = \varepsilon_{B'C'} \, \pi^A \quad . \tag{8.4.2}$$

In the compatibility equations, whenever one has terms of the kind $S_{AA'} \, \nabla^A{}_{B'} \, \lambda_{C'}$, it is therefore more convenient to symmetrize and anti-symmetrize over B' and C'. A repeated use of this algorithm leads to a considerable simplification of the lengthy calculations. For example, the preservation condition of Eq. (8.2.10) has the general form

$$3f_2\Big(\nabla_{AA'} \, \nu^A + 2f_1\lambda_{A'}\Big) + \varepsilon^{B'C'}\left[S_{AA'}\Big(\nabla^A{}_{B'} \, \lambda_{C'}\Big) + S_{AB'}\Big(\nabla^A{}_{A'} \, \lambda_{C'}\Big)\right] = 0 \, . \tag{8.4.3}$$

By virtue of Eq. (8.4.2), Eq. (8.4.3) becomes

$$f_2\Big(\nabla_{AA'} \, \nu^A + 2f_1\lambda_{A'}\Big) + S_{AA'} \, \pi^A = 0 \quad . \tag{8.4.4}$$

Following (8.2.4) and (8.2.5), the action of the supercovariant derivative on $\pi_A, \widetilde{\pi}_{A'}$ yields

$$S_{AA'} \, \pi_B \equiv \nabla_{AA'} \, \pi_B + f_1(\Lambda)\varepsilon_{AB} \, \widetilde{\pi}_{A'} \quad , \tag{8.4.5}$$

$$S_{AA'} \, \widetilde{\pi}_{B'} \equiv \nabla_{AA'} \, \widetilde{\pi}_{B'} + f_2(\Lambda)\varepsilon_{A'B'} \, \pi_A \quad . \tag{8.4.6}$$

Equations (8.4.4) and (8.4.5), jointly with the equations

$$\Box\lambda_{A'} - 2\Lambda \, \lambda_{A'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.7}$$

$$\nabla^{AA'}\,\pi_A = 2\Lambda\,\lambda^{A'} \quad , \tag{8.4.8}$$

which result from Eq. (8.4.2), lead to

$$(f_1 + f_2)\widetilde{\pi}_{A'} + (f_1 f_2 - \Lambda)\lambda_{A'} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.4.9}$$

Moreover, the preservation of Eq. (8.2.11) under (8.2.2) leads to the equation

$$S^{B'(A}\,\pi^{B)} + f_2\nabla^{B'(A}\,\nu^{B)} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.10}$$

which reduces to

$$\nabla^{B'(A}\,\pi^{B)} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.11}$$

by virtue of (8.4.1) and (8.4.5). Note that a supertwistor is also a twistor, since

$$S^{B'(A}\,\pi^{B)} = \nabla^{B'(A}\,\pi^{B)} \quad , \tag{8.4.12}$$

by virtue of the definition (8.4.5). It is now clear that, for a gauge freedom generated by twistors, the preservation of Eqs. (8.2.12) and (8.2.13) under (8.2.3) leads to the compatibility equations

$$(f_1 + f_2)\pi_A + (f_1 f_2 - \Lambda)\nu_A = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.13}$$

$$\nabla^{B(A'}\,\widetilde{\pi}^{B')} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.14}$$

where we have also used the equation (see Eqs. (8.3.6) and (8.4.1))

$$\nabla^{AA'}\,\widetilde{\pi}_{A'} = 2\Lambda\,\nu^{A} \quad . \tag{8.4.15}$$

Note that, if $f_1 + f_2 \neq 0$, one can solve Eqs. (8.4.9) and (8.4.13) as

$$\widetilde{\pi}_{A'} = \frac{(\Lambda - f_1 f_2)}{(f_1 + f_2)}\lambda_{A'} \quad , \tag{8.4.16}$$

$$\pi_A = \frac{(\Lambda - f_1 f_2)}{(f_1 + f_2)}\nu_A \quad , \tag{8.4.17}$$

and hence one deals again with Euclidean Killing spinors as in section 8.3. However, if

$$f_1 + f_2 = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.18}$$

$$f_1 f_2 - \Lambda = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.19}$$

the spinor fields $\widetilde{\pi}_{A'}$ and $\lambda_{A'}$ become *unrelated*, as well as π_A and ν_A. This is a crucial point. Hence one may have $f_1 = \pm\sqrt{-\Lambda}$, $f_2 = \mp\sqrt{-\Lambda}$, and one finds a more general structure.

In the generic case, we do not assume that ν^B and $\lambda_{B'}$ obey any equation. This means that, on the second line of Eq. (8.4.3), it is more convenient to express the term in square brackets as $2S_{A(A'} \nabla^A{}_{B')} \lambda_{C'}$. The rule (8.2.7) for the action of $S_{AA'}$ on spinors with many indices leads therefore to the compatibility conditions

$$3f_2\Big(\nabla_{AA'} \nu^A + 2f_1\lambda_{A'}\Big) - 6\Lambda \lambda_{A'} + 4f_1\widetilde{P}_{(A'B')}{}^{B'} + 3f_2\widetilde{Q}_{A'} = 0 \ , \tag{8.4.20}$$

$$3f_1\Big(\nabla_{AA'} \lambda^{A'} + 2f_2\nu_A\Big) - 6\Lambda \nu_A + 4f_2 P_{(AB)}{}^{B} + 3f_1 Q_A = 0 \ , \tag{8.4.21}$$

$$\Phi^{AB}{}_{C'D'} \lambda^{D'} + f_2 U^{(AB)}{}_{C'} - f_2 \nabla_{C'}{}^{(A} \nu^{B)} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.22}$$

$$\widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'}{}_{CD} \nu^D + f_1 \widetilde{U}^{(A'B')}{}_{C} - f_1 \nabla_C{}^{(A'} \lambda^{B')} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.4.23}$$

where the detailed form of $P, \widetilde{P}, Q, \widetilde{Q}, U, \widetilde{U}$ is not strictly necessary, but we can say that they do not depend explicitly on the trace-free part of the Ricci spinor, or on the Weyl spinors. Note that, in the massless limit $f_1 = f_2 = 0$, the Eqs. (8.4.20)–(8.4.23) reduce to the familiar form of compatibility equations which admit non-trivial solutions only in Ricci-flat backgrounds.

Our consistency analysis still makes it necessary to set to zero $\Phi^{AB}{}_{C'D'}$ (and hence $\widetilde{\Phi}^{A'B'}{}_{CD}$ by reality (Penrose and Rindler 1984)). The remaining contributions to (8.4.20)–(8.4.23) should then become algebraic relations by virtue of the twistor equation. This is confirmed by the analysis of gauge freedom for the second set of potentials in section 8.5.

8.5 Second Set of Potentials

According to the prescription of section 8.2, which replaces $\nabla_{AA'}$ by $S_{AA'}$ in the field equations (Townsend 1977), we now *assume* that the super Rarita-Schwinger equations corresponding to (7.4.4) and (7.4.13) are (see section 8.7)

$$S^{B'(F}\ \rho_{B'}{}^{A)L} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.1}$$

$$S^{B(F'}\ \theta_{B}^{A')L'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.2}$$

where the secondary potentials are subject locally to the supergauge transformations

$$\widehat{\rho}_{B'}{}^{AL} \equiv \rho_{B'}{}^{AL} + S_{B'}{}^{A}\ \mu^{L} \quad , \tag{8.5.3}$$

$$\widehat{\theta}_{B}{}^{A'L'} \equiv \theta_{B}{}^{A'L'} + S_{B}{}^{A'}\ \zeta^{L'} \quad . \tag{8.5.4}$$

The analysis of the gauge freedom of the second kind is entirely analogous to the one in section 8.3, since equations like (8.2.4) and (8.2.5) now apply to μ_L and $\zeta_{L'}$. Hence we do not repeat this investigation.

A more general gauge freedom of the twistor type relies on the supertwistor equations (see (8.4.12))

$$S_{B'}{}^{(A}\ \mu^{L)} = \nabla_{B'}{}^{(A}\ \mu^{L)} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.5}$$

$$S_{B}{}^{(A'}\ \zeta^{L')} = \nabla_{B}{}^{(A'}\ \zeta^{L')} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.5.6}$$

Thus, on requiring the preservation of the super Rarita-Schwinger equations (8.5.1) and (8.5.2) under the supergauge transformations (8.5.3) and (8.5.4), one finds the preservation conditions

$$S^{B'(F}\ S_{B'}{}^{A)}\ \mu^{L} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.7}$$

$$S^{B(F'}\ S_{B}{}^{A')}\ \zeta^{L'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.8}$$

which lead to

$$(f_1 + f_2)\pi_F + (f_1 f_2 - \Lambda)\mu_F = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.9}$$

$$(f_1 + f_2)\widetilde{\pi}_{F'} + (f_1 f_2 - \Lambda)\zeta_{F'} = 0 \quad . \tag{8.5.10}$$

Hence we can repeat the remarks following Eqs. (8.4.16)–(8.4.19). Again, it is essential that π_F, μ_F and $\widetilde{\pi}_{F'}, \zeta_{F'}$ may be unrelated if (8.4.18) and (8.4.19) hold. In the massless case, this is impossible, and hence there is no gauge freedom compatible with a non-vanishing cosmological constant.

If one does not assume the validity of Eqs. (8.5.5) and (8.5.6), the general preservation equations (8.5.7) and (8.5.8) lead instead to the compatibility conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi^{AFL}{}_{D}\,\mu^{D} - 2\Lambda\,\mu^{(A}\,\varepsilon^{F)L} + 2f_2\omega^{(AF)L} + f_1\varepsilon^{L(A}\,T^{F)} \\ &+ f_1\varepsilon^{L(A}\,S^{F)B'}\,\zeta_{B'} = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{8.5.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{\psi}^{A'F'L'}{}_{D'}\,\zeta^{D'} - 2\Lambda\,\zeta^{(A'}\,\varepsilon^{F')L'} + 2f_1\widetilde{\omega}^{(A'F')L'} + f_2\varepsilon^{L'(A'}\,\widetilde{T}^{F')} \\ &+ f_2\varepsilon^{L'(A'}\,\widetilde{S}^{F')B}\,\mu_B = 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{8.5.12}$$

If we now combine the compatibility equations (8.4.20)–(8.4.23) with (8.5.11) and (8.5.12), and require that the gauge fields $\nu_A, \lambda_{A'}, \mu_A, \zeta_{A'}$ should not depend explicitly on the curvature of the background, we find that the trace-free part of the Ricci spinor has to vanish, and the Riemannian four-geometry is forced to be conformally flat, since under our assumptions the equations

$$\psi_{AFLD}\,\mu^{D} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.13}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{A'F'L'D'}\,\zeta^{D'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.5.14}$$

force the anti-self-dual and self-dual Weyl spinors to vanish. Remarkably, Eqs. (8.5.13) and (8.5.14) are just the integrability conditions for the existence of non-trivial solutions of the supertwistor equations (8.5.5) and (8.5.6). Hence the spinor fields $\omega, S, T, \widetilde{\omega}, \widetilde{S}$ and $\widetilde{T}$ in (8.5.11) and (8.5.12) are such that these equations reduce to (8.5.9) and (8.5.10). In other words, for massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials, the gauge freedom is indeed generated by solutions of the twistor equations in conformally flat Einstein four-manifolds.

Last, on inserting the local equations (7.4.1) and (7.4.11) into the second half of the Rarita-Schwinger equations, and then replacing $\nabla_{AA'}$ by $S_{AA'}$, one finds equations whose preservation under the supergauge transformations (8.5.3) and (8.5.4) is again guaranteed if the supertwistor equations (8.5.5) and (8.5.6) hold.

8.6 Non-Linear Superconnection

As a first step in the proof that Eqs. (8.5.1) and (8.5.2) arise naturally as integrability conditions of a suitable connection, we introduce a partial superconnection $W_{A'}$ (cf. Penrose 1994) acting on unprimed spinor fields η_D defined on the Riemannian background.

With our notation

$$W_{A'}\ \eta_D \equiv \eta^A\ S_{AA'}\ \eta_D - \eta_B\ \eta_C\ \rho_{A'}{}^{BC}\ \eta_D \quad . \tag{8.6.1}$$

Writing

$$W_{A'} = \eta^A\ \Omega_{AA'} \quad , \tag{8.6.2}$$

where the operator $\Omega_{AA'}$ acts on spinor fields η_D, we obtain

$$\eta^A\ \Omega_{AA'} = \eta^A\ S_{AA'} - \eta_B\ \eta_C\ \rho_{A'}{}^{BC} \quad . \tag{8.6.3}$$

Following Penrose 1994, we require that $\Omega_{AA'}$ should provide a genuine superconnection on the spin-bundle, so that it acts in any direction. Thus, from (8.6.3) one can take (cf. Penrose 1994)

$$\Omega_{AA'} \equiv S_{AA'} - \eta^C\ \rho_{A'AC} = S_{AA'} - \eta^C\ \rho_{A'(AC)} + \frac{1}{2}\eta_A\ \rho_{A'} \quad . \tag{8.6.4}$$

Note that (8.6.4) makes it necessary to know the trace $\rho_{A'}$, while in (8.6.1) only the symmetric part of $\rho_{A'}{}^{BC}$ survives. Thus we can see that, independently of the analysis in the previous sections, the definition of $\Omega_{AA'}$ picks out a potential of the Rarita-Schwinger type (Penrose 1994).

8.7 Integrability Condition

In section 8.6 we have introduced a superconnection $\Omega_{AA'}$ which acts on a bundle with non-linear fibres, where the term $-\eta^C\ \rho_{A'AC}$ is responsible for the non-linear nature of $\Omega_{AA'}$ (see (8.6.4)). Following Penrose 1994, we now pass to a description in terms of a vector bundle of rank three. On introducing the local coordinates (u_A, ξ), where

$$u_A = \xi\ \eta_A \quad , \tag{8.7.1}$$

the action of the new operator $\widetilde{\Omega}_{AA'}$ reads (cf. Penrose 1994)

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_{AA'}(u_B, \xi) \equiv \Big(S_{AA'}\ u_B, S_{AA'}\ \xi - u^C\ \rho_{A'AC} \Big) \quad . \tag{8.7.2}$$

Now we are able to prove that Eqs. (8.5.1) and (8.5.2) are integrability conditions.

The super β-surfaces are totally null two-surfaces whose tangent vector has the form $u^A\ \pi^{A'}$, where $\pi^{A'}$ is varying and u^A obeys the equation

$$u^A\ S_{AA'}\ u_B = 0 \quad , \tag{8.7.3}$$

which means that u^A is supercovariantly constant over the surface. On defining

$$\tau_{A'} \equiv u_B\ u_C\ \rho_{A'}{}^{BC} \quad , \tag{8.7.4}$$

the condition for $\widetilde{\Omega}_{AA'}$ to be integrable on super β-surfaces is (cf. Penrose 1994)

$$u^A\ \widetilde{\Omega}_{AA'}\ \tau^{A'} = u_A\ u_B\ u_C\ S^{A'(A}\ \rho_{A'}{}^{B)C} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.7.5}$$

by virtue of the Leibniz rule and of (8.7.2)–(8.7.4). Equation (8.7.5) implies

$$S^{A'(A}\ \rho_{A'}{}^{B)C} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.7.6}$$

which is the Eq. (8.5.1). Similarly, on studying super α-surfaces defined by the equation

$$\widetilde{u}^{A'}\ S_{AA'}\ \widetilde{u}_{B'} = 0 \quad , \tag{8.7.7}$$

one obtains Eq. (8.5.2). Thus, although Eqs. (8.5.1) and (8.5.2) are naturally suggested by the local theory of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials, they have a deeper geometric origin, as shown.

8.8 Results and Open Problems

We have given an entirely two-spinor description of massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials in Einstein four-geometries. Although the supercovariant derivative (8.2.1) was well known in the literature, following the work in Townsend 1977, and its Lorentzian version was already applied in Perry 1984 and Siklos 1985, the systematic analysis of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials with the local form of their supergauge transformations was not yet available in the literature, to the best of our knowledge, before the work in Esposito and Pollifrone 1996.

Our first result is the two-spinor proof that, for massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials, the gauge freedom is generated by solutions of the supertwistor equations in conformally flat Einstein four-manifolds. Moreover, we have shown that the first-order equations (8.5.1) and (8.5.2), whose consideration is suggested by the local theory of massive spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potentials, admit a deeper geometric interpretation as integrability conditions on super β- and super α-surfaces of a connection on a rank-three vector bundle. This result generalizes the analysis of massless spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ fields appearing in chapter seven. One now has to find explicit solutions of the Eqs. (8.2.10)–(8.2.13), and the supercovariant form of β-surfaces studied in our chapter deserves a more careful consideration. Hence we hope that our work can lead to a better understanding of twistor geometry and consistent supergravity theories in four dimensions.

CHAPTER NINE

LOCAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS IN QUANTUM SUPERGRAVITY

Abstract. When quantum supergravity is studied on manifolds with boundary, one may consider local boundary conditions which fix on the initial surface the whole primed part of tangential components of gravitino perturbations, and fix on the final surface the whole unprimed part of tangential components of gravitino perturbations. This chapter studies such local boundary conditions in a flat Euclidean background bounded by two concentric three-spheres. It is shown that, as far as three-dimensional transverse-traceless perturbations are concerned, the resulting contribution to $\zeta(0)$ vanishes when such boundary data are set to zero, exactly as in the case when non-local boundary conditions of the spectral type are imposed. These properties may be used to show that one-loop finiteness of massless supergravity models is only achieved when two boundary three-surfaces occur, and there is no exact cancellation of the contributions of gauge and ghost modes in the Faddeev-Popov path integral. In these particular cases, which rely on the use of covariant gauge-averaging functionals, pure gravity is one-loop finite as well.

The problem of a consistent formulation of quantum supergravity on manifolds with boundary is still receiving careful consideration in the current literature (Esposito 1994a, D'Eath 1996, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996, Esposito et al. 1997). In particular, many efforts have been produced to understand whether simple supergravity is one-loop finite in the presence of boundaries. In the analysis of such an issue, the first problem consists, of course, in a careful choice of boundary conditions. For massless gravitino potentials, which are the object of our investigation, these may be non-local of the spectral type (D'Eath and Esposito 1991b) or local (Esposito 1996).

In the former case the idea is to fix at the boundary half of the gravitino potential. On the final surface Σ_F one can fix those perturbative modes which multiply harmonics having positive eigenvalues of the intrinsic three-dimensional Dirac operator $\mathcal{D}$ of the boundary. On the initial surface one can instead fix those gravitino modes which multiply harmonics having negative eigenvalues of the intrinsic three-dimensional Dirac operator of the boundary. What is non-local in this procedure is the separation of the spectrum of a first-order elliptic operator (our $\mathcal{D}$) into a positive and a negative part. This leads to a sort of positive- and negative-frequency split which is typical for scattering problems (D'Eath 1996), but may also be applied to the analysis of quantum amplitudes in finite regions (Esposito et al. 1997).

Our chapter deals instead with the latter choice, i.e. local boundary conditions for quantum supergravity. By this one usually means a formulation where complementary projection operators act on gravitational and spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ perturbations. Local boundary conditions of this type were investigated in Luckock and Moss 1989, Luckock 1991, and then applied to quantum cosmological backgrounds in Esposito 1994a–b, Moss and Poletti 1994, Esposito et al. 1994a–b, Esposito et al. 1995a–b, Esposito et al. 1997.

More recently, another choice of local boundary conditions for gravitino perturbations has been considered in D'Eath 1996. Using two-component spinor notation, and referring the reader to D'Eath 1984 and D'Eath 1996 for notation

and background material, we here represent the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential by a pair of independent spinor-valued one-forms $\left(\psi_{\mu}^{A}, \widetilde{\psi}_{\mu}^{A'}\right)$ in a Riemannian four-manifold which is taken to be flat Euclidean four-space bounded by two concentric three-spheres (Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996). Denoting by S_I and S_F the boundary three-spheres, with radii a and b respectively (here $b > a$), the local boundary conditions proposed in D'Eath 1996 read in our case ($i = 1, 2, 3$)

$$\left[\widetilde{\psi}_{i}^{A'}\right]_{S_I} = F_{i}^{A'} \quad , \tag{9.1}$$

$$\left[\psi_{i}^{A}\right]_{S_F} = H_{i}^{A} \quad , \tag{9.2}$$

where $F_{i}^{A'}$ and H_{i}^{A} are boundary data which may or may not satisfy the classical constraint equations (D'Eath 1996). With the choice (9.1) and (9.2), the whole primed part of the tangential components of the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential is fixed on S_I, and the whole unprimed part of the tangential components of the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ potential is fixed on S_F.

In a Hamiltonian analysis, ψ_{0}^{A} and $\widetilde{\psi}_{0}^{A'}$ are Lagrange multipliers (D'Eath 1996), and hence boundary conditions for them look un-natural in a one-loop calculation, especially if one is interested in reduction to three-dimensional transverse-traceless (TT) gravitino modes (usually regarded as the *physical* part of gravitinos). In a covariant path-integral analysis, however, one cannot disregard the issue of boundary conditions on normal components of gravitinos. We shall thus post-pone the discussion of this point, and we will focus on the TT sector of the boundary conditions (9.1) and (9.2).

With the notation of Esposito 1994a, the expansion in harmonics on three-spheres of the TT part of tangential components of spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ perturbations reads

$$\psi_{i}^{A} = \frac{\tau^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p,q=1}^{(n+1)(n+4)} \alpha_{n}^{pq} \Big[m_{np}(\tau) \beta^{nqACC'} + \widetilde{r}_{np}(\tau) \overline{\mu}^{nqACC'} \Big] e_{CC'i} \quad , \tag{9.3}$$

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i}^{A'} = \frac{\tau^{-\frac{3}{2}}}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p,q=1}^{(n+1)(n+4)} \alpha_{n}^{pq} \Big[\widetilde{m}_{np}(\tau) \overline{\beta}^{nqA'C'C} + r_{np}(\tau) \mu^{nqA'C'C} \Big] e_{CC'i} \quad , \tag{9.4}$$

where $\beta^{nqACC'} \equiv -\rho^{nq(ACD)} n_{D}^{\ C'}$ and $\mu^{nqA'C'C} \equiv -\sigma^{nq(A'C'D')} n^{C}_{\ D'}$. Of course, round brackets denote complete symmetrization over spinor indices, and $n^{C}_{\ D'}$ is obtained from the Euclidean normal as $n^{C}_{\ D'} = i_e n^{C}_{\ D'}$. Variation of the TT gravitino action yields, for all integer $n \geq 0$, the following eigenvalue equations for gravitino modes:

$$\left(\frac{d}{d\tau} - \frac{(n+5/2)}{\tau} \right) x_{np} = E_{np}\, \widetilde{x}_{np} \quad , \tag{9.5}$$

$$\left(-\frac{d}{d\tau} - \frac{(n+5/2)}{\tau} \right) \widetilde{x}_{np} = E_{np}\, x_{np} \quad , \tag{9.6}$$

where $x_{np} = m_{np}$ and $\widetilde{x}_{np} = \widetilde{m}_{np}$, or $x_{np} = r_{np}$ and $\widetilde{x}_{np} = \widetilde{r}_{np}$. The Eqs. (9.5) and (9.6) lead to the following basis functions in terms of modified Bessel functions (hereafter $M \equiv E_{np}$ for simplicity of notation, while $\beta_{1,n}$ and $\beta_{2,n}$ are some constants):

$$m_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n} \sqrt{\tau} I_{n+2}(M\tau) + \beta_{2,n} \sqrt{\tau} K_{n+2}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{9.7}$$

$$\widetilde{m}_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n} \sqrt{\tau} I_{n+3}(M\tau) - \beta_{2,n} \sqrt{\tau} K_{n+3}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{9.8}$$

$$r_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n} \sqrt{\tau} I_{n+2}(M\tau) + \beta_{2,n} \sqrt{\tau} K_{n+2}(M\tau) \quad , \tag{9.9}$$

$$\widetilde{r}_{np}(\tau) = \beta_{1,n} \sqrt{\tau} I_{n+3}(M\tau) - \beta_{2,n} \sqrt{\tau} K_{n+3}(M\tau) \quad . \tag{9.10}$$

By virtue of (9.1) and (9.2), these modes obey the boundary conditions

$$\widetilde{m}_{np}(a) = A_n \quad , \tag{9.11a}$$

$$r_{np}(a) = A_n \quad , \tag{9.11b}$$

$$m_{np}(b) = B_n \quad , \tag{9.12a}$$

$$\widetilde{r}_{np}(b) = B_n \quad , \tag{9.12b}$$

where A_n and B_n are constants resulting from the boundary data $F_i^{A'}$ and H_i^A respectively. The boundary conditions (9.11) and (9.12) lead therefore, if $A_n = B_n = 0$, $\forall n$, to the eigenvalue condition

$$I_{n+3}(Mr)K_{n+2}(Mr) + I_{n+2}(Mr)K_{n+3}(Mr) = 0 \quad , \tag{9.13}$$

where $r = a$ or b.

We can now apply ζ-function regularization to evaluate the resulting TT contribution to the one-loop divergence, following the algorithm developed in Barvinsky et al. 1992 and already used in section 6.2. The basic steps are as follows. Let us denote by f_l the function occurring in the equation obeyed by the eigenvalues by virtue of boundary conditions, after taking out fake roots (e.g. $x = 0$ is a fake root of order n of the Bessel function I_n). Let $d(l)$ be the degeneracy of the eigenvalues parametrized by the integer l. One can then define the function

$$I(M^2, s) \equiv \sum_{l=l_0}^{\infty} d(l) l^{-2s} \log f_l(M^2) \quad . \tag{9.14}$$

Such a function admits an analytic continuation to the complex-s plane as a meromorphic function with a simple pole at $s = 0$, in the form

$$\text{“}I(M^2, s)\text{”} = \frac{I_{\rm pole}(M^2)}{s} + I^R(M^2) + \mathrm{O}(s) \quad . \tag{9.15}$$

The function $I_{\rm pole}(M^2)$ is the residue at $s = 0$, and makes it possible to obtain the $\zeta(0)$ value as

$$\zeta(0) = I_{\log} + I_{\rm pole}(M^2 = \infty) - I_{\rm pole}(M^2 = 0) \quad , \tag{9.16}$$

where $I_{\log}$ is the coefficient of the $\log M$ term in I^R as $M \to \infty$. Moreover, $I_{\rm pole}(\infty)$ coincides with the coefficient of $\frac{1}{l}$ in the expansion as $l \to \infty$ of $\frac{1}{2} d(l) \log[\rho_\infty(l)]$, where $\rho_\infty(l)$ is the l-dependent term in the eigenvalue condition as $M \to \infty$ and $l \to \infty$. The $I_{\rm pole}(0)$ value is instead obtained as the coefficient of $\frac{1}{l}$ in the

expansion as $l \to \infty$ of $\frac{1}{2}d(l)\log[\rho_0(l)]$, where $\rho_0(l)$ is the l-dependent term in the eigenvalue condition as $M \to 0$ and $l \to \infty$.

In our problem, using the limiting form of Bessel functions when the argument tends to zero, one finds that the left-hand side of Eq. (9.13) is proportional to M^{-1} as $M \to 0$. Hence one has to multiply by M to get rid of fake roots. Moreover, in the uniform asymptotic expansion of Bessel functions as $M \to \infty$ and $n \to \infty$ (Olver 1954), both I and K functions contribute a $\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}}$ factor. These properties imply that $I_{\log}$ vanishes (hereafter $l \equiv n+1$):

$$I_{\log} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2l(l+3)\Big(1 - 1/2 - 1/2\Big) = 0 \quad . \tag{9.17}$$

Moreover, $I_{\rm pole}(\infty)$ vanishes since there is no l-dependent coefficient in the uniform asymptotic expansion of Eq. (9.13) as $M \to \infty$ and $l \to \infty$. Last, $I_{\rm pole}(0)$ vanishes as well, since the limiting form of Eq. (9.13) as $M \to 0$ and $l \to \infty$ is $\frac{1}{r}M^{-1}$. One thus finds for gravitinos

$$\zeta_{TT}(0) = 0 \quad . \tag{9.18}$$

It is now clear that local boundary conditions for ψ_0^A and $\widetilde{\psi}_0^{A'}$ along the same lines of (9.1) and (9.2), i.e. (here $\kappa^{A'}$ and μ^A are some boundary data)

$$\Big[\widetilde{\psi}_0^{A'}\Big]_{S_I} = \kappa^{A'} \quad , \tag{9.19}$$

$$\Big[\psi_0^{A}\Big]_{S_F} = \mu^{A} \quad , \tag{9.20}$$

give again a vanishing contribution to $\zeta(0)$ in this two-boundary problem if $\kappa^{A'}$ and μ^A are set to zero, since the resulting eigenvalue condition is analogous to Eq. (9.13) with n replaced by $n-1$.

A suitable set of local boundary conditions on metric perturbations $h_{\mu\nu}$ are the ones considered by Luckock, Moss and Poletti (Luckock 1991, Moss and Poletti

1994, Moss 1996, Moss and Silva 1997). In our problem, denoting by $g_{\mu\nu}$ the background four-metric, they read (Esposito et al. 1997)

$$\Big[h_{ij}\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{9.21}$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial h_{00}}{\partial \tau} + \frac{6}{\tau}h_{00} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\Big(g^{ij}h_{ij}\Big)\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{9.22}$$

$$\Big[h_{0i}\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{9.23}$$

while the ghost one-form is subject to the mixed boundary conditions

$$\Big[\varphi_0\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{9.24}$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial \tau} - \frac{2}{\tau}\varphi_i\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{9.25}$$

As first shown in Esposito et al. 1994b, graviton TT modes contribute

$$\zeta_{TT}(0) = -5 \quad , \tag{9.26}$$

while, using a covariant gauge-averaging functional of the de Donder type, gauge and ghost modes contribute

$$\zeta(0)_{\text{gauge and ghost}} = 5 \quad . \tag{9.27}$$

One thus finds that the one-loop path integral for the gravitational sector, including TT, gauge and ghost modes, gives a vanishing contribution to the one-loop divergence.

What is left are gauge and ghost modes for gravitino perturbations. In general, their separate values depend on the gauge-averaging functional being used (only the full one-loop divergence should be gauge-independent (Endo 1995)). However, on general ground, since in our *flat* Euclidean background all possible contributions to $\zeta(0)$ involve surface integrals of terms like (cf. section 5.2)

$$\mathrm{Tr}(K^3) \ , \ (\mathrm{Tr}K)(\mathrm{Tr}K^2) \ , \ (\mathrm{Tr}K)^3 \quad ,$$

K denoting the extrinsic-curvature tensor of the boundary, any dependence on the three-spheres radii a and b disappears after integration over ∂M. Moreover, *if* the formalism is gauge-independent ax expected, the one-loop result can only coincide with the one found in Sec. V of Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996 in the axial gauge:

$$\zeta_{\frac{3}{2}}(0) = 0 \quad . \tag{9.28}$$

The following concluding remarks are now in order:

(i) The one-loop finiteness suggested by our analysis does not seem to contradict the results of Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996. What is shown therein is instead that, when flat Euclidean four-space is bounded by *only one* three-sphere, simple supergravity fails to be one-loop finite (either spectral boundary conditions with non-covariant gauge, or local boundary conditions in covariant gauge). This is *not* our background. Moreover, the two-boundary problem of Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996 was studied in a non-covariant gauge of the axial type, when the Faddeev-Popov path integral is supplemented by the integrability condition for the eigenvalue equations on graviton and gravitino perturbations. This quantization was found to pick out TT modes only, but differs from the scheme proposed in our chapter (Esposito 1996).

(ii) The result (9.28) is crucial for one-loop finiteness to hold (when combined with (9.26) and (9.27)), and its explicit proof has not yet been achieved.

(iii) As a further check of one-loop finiteness (or of its lack, cf. van Nieuwenhuizen and Vermaseren 1976), one should now perform two-boundary calculations of $\zeta(0)$ when Luckock-Moss-Poletti local boundary conditions are imposed on gravitino perturbations.

(iv) Yet another check might be obtained by combining Barvinsky boundary conditions for pure gravity (Barvinsky 1987) in the de Donder gauge (these are completely invariant under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms) with local or non-local boundary conditions for gravitinos in covariant gauges (Endo 1995).

(v) The calculations performed in Avramidi et al. 1996, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996, Esposito et al. 1997 and in our chapter show that, when cancellation of the effects of gauge and ghost modes is achieved, only the effects of TT modes survive, and hence both pure gravity and simple supergravity are not even one-loop finite. By contrast, if the effects of gauge and ghost modes do not cancel each other exactly (e.g. by using covariant gauge-averaging functionals in the Faddeev-Popov path integral), then both pure gravity and simple supergravity may turn out to be one-loop finite in the presence of two bounding three-spheres.

(vi) A deep problem is the relation between the Hamiltonian analysis in D'Eath 1996, where auxiliary fields play an important role but ghost fields are not studied, and the path-integral approach of Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996, where ghost fields are analyzed in detail but auxiliary fields are not found to affect the one-loop calculation.

All this adds evidence in favour of quantum cosmology being able to lead to new perspectives in Euclidean quantum gravity and quantum supergravity (cf. van Nieuwenhuizen 1981, Esposito et al. 1997).

CHAPTER TEN

NEW FRONTIERS

Abstract. Quarks are spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles for which a Dirac operator can be studied. The local boundary conditions studied for models of quark confinement coincide with the local boundary conditions studied, more recently, in one-loop quantum cosmology. Further developments lie in the possibility to study quantization schemes in conformally invariant gauges. This possibility is investigated in the case of the Eastwood-Singer gauge for vacuum Maxwell theory on manifolds with boundary. This is part of a more general scheme, leading to the analysis of conformally covariant operators. These are also presented, with emphasis on the Paneitz operator. Last, a class of boundary operators are described which include the effect of tangential derivatives. They lead to many new invariants in the general form of heat-kernel asymptotics for operators of Laplace type. The consideration of tangential derivatives arises naturally within the framework of recent attempts to obtain BRST-invariant boundary conditions in quantum field theory. However, in Euclidean quantum gravity, it remains unclear how to write even just the general form of the various heat-kernel coefficients.

10.1 Introduction

So far we have dealt with many aspects of manifolds with boundary in mathematics and physics. Hence it seems appropriate to begin the last chapter of our monograph with a brief review of the areas of research which provide the main motivations for similar investigations. They are as follows.

(i) Index theorems for manifolds with boundary. One wants to understand how to extend index theorems, originally proved for closed manifolds, to manifolds with boundary (Atiyah and Singer 1963, Atiyah and Bott 1965, Atiyah 1975b). A naturally occurring analytic tool is indeed the use of complex powers of elliptic operators, via η- and ζ-functions.

(ii) Spectral geometry with mixed boundary conditions. Spinor fields, gauge fields and gravitation are subject to mixed boundary conditions. These may be local or non-local (Esposito et al. 1997), and reflect the first-order nature of the Dirac operator, and the symmetries of gauge fields and gravitation (e.g. invariance under local gauge transformations, invariance under (infinitesimal) diffeomorphisms, BRST symmetry, supersymmetry). The resulting boundary operators may be (complementary) projectors, or first-order differential operators. They lead to a heat-kernel asymptotics which is completely understood only in the cases involving a mixture of Dirichlet and Robin boundary conditions (Gilkey 1995, Esposito et al. 1997, Avramidi and Esposito 1997).

(iii) Quantum cosmology. The path-integral approach to quantum cosmology needs a well-defined prescription for the "sum over histories" which should define the quantum state of the universe (Hawking 1979, Hawking 1982, Hartle and Hawking 1983, Hawking 1984, Gibbons and Hawking 1993, Esposito 1994a, Esposito et al. 1997).

(iv) Quantum field theory on manifolds with boundary. Boundaries play a crucial role to obtain a complete and well defined mathematical model for the quantization

of all fundamental interactions. Indeed, one is already familiar with the need to specify boundary data from the analysis of potential theory, waveguides, and the classical variational problem (cf. York 1986).

(v) Boundary counterterms in supergravity. The presence of boundaries provides a crucial test of the finiteness properties of supersymmetric theories of gravitation, e.g. simple supergravity (D'Eath 1996, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1996, Esposito 1996, Moniz 1996, Esposito et al. 1997).

(vi) Applications of quantum field theory. Variations of zero-point energies of the quantized electromagnetic field are finite, measurable, and depend on the geometry of the problem. This is what one learns from the Casimir effect (Casimir 1948, Sparnay 1958, Boyer 1968, Grib et al. 1994, Esposito et al. 1997, Lamoreaux 1997). Moreover, the consideration of boundary effects provides a useful toy model for the investigation of quark confinement, as is shown in the following section (Chodos et al. 1974).

10.2 Quark Boundary Conditions

A non-trivial application of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fields to modern physics consists of the mathematical models for quark fields. We here focus on the model proposed by Chodos et al. (1974), which describes elementary particles as composite systems, with their internal structure being associated with quark and gluon field variables. Their main idea was to account for the internal structure with the help of fields. However, the fields which describe the sub-structure of the hadron *belong only to the sub-structure of a particle*, and cannot be extended to all points of space, unlike the normal situation in field theory. In other words, field variables are confined on the subset of points which are inside of an extended particle. Such a set of points represents *the bag*. Since then, the model has been called M. I. T. bag model (the authors being research workers of the M. I. T.). Following the presentation in

Johnson 1975, one can say that a local disturbance of some medium leads to a collective motion described by fields, which are taken to be the quark-gluon fields. The localized excitation consists of a particle, i.e. a hadron.

When the M. I. T. model was first proposed, there was (of course) great excitement in the physics community. Whether or not the model by Chodos et al. can still have an impact on current developments in particle physics, it provides a first relevant example of local boundary conditions on fields acted upon by a Dirac operator, and this is the feature that we want to emphasize hereafter. For this purpose, we follow again Johnson (1975), and we denote by $q_a(x)$ the quark field. This is a Dirac field carrying colour and flavour. Bearing in mind what we said at the beginning, the quark fields can only be associated with points *inside the hadron*. Outside the hadron, $q_a(x)$ vanishes by definition. The local flux of colour and flavour quantum numbers inside the hadron is

$$j^{\mu}_{ab}(x) \equiv \overline{q}_a(x)\ \gamma^{\mu}\ q_b(x) \quad . \tag{10.2.1}$$

To avoid losing quantum numbers through the surface, one has to impose the boundary condition (hereafter, n^{μ} is the inward-pointing normal to the boundary)

$$\Big[n_{\mu}\ j^{\mu}_{ab}(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.2.2a}$$

where ∂M denotes the surface of the hadron. By virtue of (10.2.1), the boundary condition (10.2.2a) may be re-expressed in the form

$$\Big[\overline{q}_a(x)\ n_{\mu}\ \gamma^{\mu}\ q_b(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.2.2b}$$

At this stage we remark that, denoting by ε a real-valued function of position on the boundary (ε was taken equal to ± 1 in Johnson 1975):

$$\varepsilon : y \in \partial M \longrightarrow \varepsilon(y) \in \Re \quad ,$$

if one imposes the local boundary condition

$$\Big[\Big(i\ n_{\mu}\ \gamma^{\mu} - \varepsilon\Big) q_a(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.2.3}$$

one obtains also the "conjugate" boundary condition

$$\left[\overline{q}_a(x)\Big(i\ n_\mu\ \gamma^\mu + \varepsilon\Big)\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.2.4}$$

By virtue of Eq. (10.2.3) one now finds

$$\Big[i\ n_\mu\ j^\mu_{ab}(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = \Big[\overline{q}_a(x)\ i\ n_\mu\ \gamma^\mu\ q_b(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = \Big[\varepsilon\ \overline{q}_a(x)\ q_b(x)\Big]_{\partial M} \quad . \tag{10.2.5}$$

Moreover, by virtue of Eq. (10.2.4) one also has

$$\Big[i\ n_\mu\ j^\mu_{ab}(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = -\Big[\varepsilon\ \overline{q}_a(x)\ q_b(x)\Big]_{\partial M} \quad . \tag{10.2.6}$$

The comparison of Eqs. (10.2.5) and (10.2.6) leads to

$$\Big[\overline{q}_a(x)\ q_b(x)\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.2.7}$$

which in turn ensures the fulfillment of the condition (10.2.2a), bearing in mind the definition (10.2.1).

The local boundary conditions (10.2.3) find another relevant physical application in a completely different framework, i.e. (one-loop) quantum cosmology. A review of the necessary steps is given in the following section.

10.3 Quantum Cosmology

In the early nineties, there was an intensive investigation of local boundary conditions for the Dirac operator in one-loop quantum cosmology (e.g. D'Eath and Esposito 1991a, Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1993, Esposito 1994a, Moss and Poletti 1994). The motivations for this programme were as follows.

(i) If one studies local boundary conditions for solutions of the massless free-field equations, following the work of Breitenlohner and Freedman 1982 and Hawking

1983, one finds that there exist solutions of the Euclidean twistor equation which generate *rigid supersymmetry transformations* among *classical solutions* obeying boundary conditions of the type

$$\sqrt{2}\ {}_{e}n_{A}{}^{A'}\ \phi^{A}=\pm\widetilde{\phi}^{A'}\quad\text{on}\quad\partial M\quad, \tag{10.3.1}$$

$$2\ {}_{e}n_{A}{}^{A'}\ {}_{e}n_{B}{}^{B'}\ \rho^{AB}=\pm\widetilde{\rho}^{A'B'}\quad\text{on}\quad\partial M\quad. \tag{10.3.2}$$

(ii) Following instead the work in Luckock and Moss 1989, Luckock 1991, one finds that *local supersymmetry transformations* exist in supergravity which fix at the boundary the spatial components of the tetrad and a projector acting on spinor-valued one-forms which represent the gravitino potentials. On extending this scheme to lower-spin fields in a supergravity multiplet, one obtains the local boundary conditions

$$\sqrt{2}\ {}_{e}n_{A}{}^{A'}\ \psi^{A}=\pm\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}\quad\text{on}\quad\partial M \tag{10.3.3}$$

for a massless spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field which can be expanded in a complete orthonormal set of eigenfunctions of the Dirac operator.

In particular, on studying a portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by a three-sphere of radius a (Schleich 1985), the boundary conditions (10.3.3) were found to imply the eigenvalue condition (D'Eath and Esposito 1991a, Esposito 1994a)

$$F(E)\equiv[J_{n+1}(Ea)]^{2}-[J_{n+2}(Ea)]^{2}=0\quad\forall n\geq 0\quad. \tag{10.3.4}$$

Although the boundary conditions (10.3.3) were the two-component spinor version of the boundary conditions (10.2.3), it was a non-trivial step, both technically and conceptually, to undertake the analysis of heat-kernel asymptotics with this class of local boundary conditions for the Dirac operator (see Falomir 1996 for the discussion of possible topological obstructions). Nevertheless, the result in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a (see also our appendix 10.A):

$$\zeta(0)=\frac{11}{360}\quad, \tag{10.3.5}$$

later confirmed, independently, by several authors (Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1993, Moss and Poletti 1994, Dowker 1996, Dowker et al. 1996, Kirsten and Cognola 1996), provided evidence in favour of local boundary conditions for the Dirac operator being admissible in a number of relevant cases. Note that, by requiring that Eq. (10.3.3) should be preserved under the action of the Dirac operator, one obtains the complementary condition (Esposito 1994a)

$$\left[\left({}_{e}n^{BB'}\nabla_{BB'}+\frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Tr}K)\right)\left(\sqrt{2}\,{}_{e}n_{A}{}^{A'}\,\psi^{A}\pm\widetilde{\psi}^{A'}\right)\right]_{\partial M}=0 \quad . \tag{10.3.6}$$

In other words, denoting by P_{-} and P_{+} two complementary projectors, where

$$P_{\pm}\equiv\frac{1}{2}\Big(1\pm i\gamma_{5}\,\gamma_{\mu}\,n^{\mu}\Big) \quad , \tag{10.3.7}$$

the boundary conditions (10.3.3) and (10.3.6) can be cast in the form

$$\Big[P_{-}\phi\Big]_{\partial M}=0 \quad , \tag{10.3.8}$$

$$\left[\Big(n^{a}\nabla_{a}+\frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Tr}K)\Big)P_{+}\phi\right]_{\partial M}=0 \quad , \tag{10.3.9}$$

which is the form of mixed boundary conditions studied in section 5.4.

Another important result was that, for a massless spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field subject to non-local boundary conditions of the form described in section 6.1, one finds again the conformal anomaly (10.3.5) when the same flat background with boundary is studied. This result was obtained in D'Eath and Esposito 1991b by using the Laplace transform of the heat equation and, independently, by Kamenshchik and Mishakov (1992), who used instead the powerful analytic technique derived by Barvinsky et al. (1992). The result was non-trivial because no geometric formulae for heat-kernel asymptotics with non-local boundary conditions were available at that time in the literature. Thus, analytic methods for $\zeta(0)$ calculations were the only way to investigate such issues.

The current developments in one-loop quantum cosmology deal instead with mixed boundary conditions for gauge fields and gravitation, and with different quantization techniques for such fields. Since many topics are already studied in detail by Esposito et al. (1994a–b, 1995a–b, 1997), we prefer to focus, in the following section, on open problems. As one might expect, the main source of fascinating open problems lies in the attempts to quantize the gravitational field.

10.4 Conformal Gauges and Manifolds with Boundary

The recent attempts to quantize Euclidean Maxwell theory in quantum cosmological backgrounds have led to a detailed investigation of the quantized Maxwell field in covariant and non-covariant gauges on manifolds with boundary (Esposito 1994a–b, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1994, Vassilevich 1995a-b, Esposito et al. 1997). The main emphasis has been on the use of analytic or geometric techniques to evaluate the one-loop semiclassical approximation of the wave function of the universe, when magnetic or electric boundary conditions are imposed. In the former case one sets to zero at the boundary the tangential components A_k of the potential (the background value of A_μ is taken to vanish), the real-valued ghost fields ω and ψ (or, equivalently, a complex-valued ghost zero-form ε), and the gauge-averaging functional $\Phi(A)$:

$$\Big[A_k\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.4.1}$$

$$[\varepsilon]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.4.2}$$

$$\Big[\Phi(A)\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.4.3}$$

In the electric scheme one sets instead to zero at the boundary the normal component of A_μ, jointly with the normal derivative of the ghost and the normal derivative of A_k:

$$\Big[A_0\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.4.4}$$

$$\left[\partial\varepsilon/\partial n\right]_{\partial M}=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.5}$$

$$\left[\partial A_k/\partial n\right]_{\partial M}=0 \quad . \tag{10.4.6}$$

The boundary conditions (10.4.1)–(10.4.3) and (10.4.4)–(10.4.6) are found to be invariant under infinitesimal gauge transformations on A_μ, as well as under BRST transformations (Esposito et al. 1997).

On the other hand, the gauge-averaging functionals studied in Esposito 1994, Esposito and Kamenshchik 1994, Vassilevich 1995a–b, Esposito et al. 1997, were not conformally invariant, although a conformally invariant choice of gauge was already known, at the *classical* level, from the work of Eastwood and Singer (1985). It has been therefore our aim to investigate the *quantum* counterpart of the conformally invariant scheme proposed in Eastwood and Singer 1985, to complete the current work on quantized gauge fields. For this purpose, we have studied a portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by three-dimensional surfaces. The vanishing curvature of the four-dimensional background is helpful to obtain a preliminary understanding of the quantum operators, which will be shown to have highly nontrivial properties. In our scheme, all curvature effects result from the boundary only.

In flat Euclidean four-space, the conformally invariant gauge proposed in Eastwood and Singer 1985 reads (hereafter $b,c=0,1,2,3$)

$$\nabla_b\nabla^b\nabla^c A_c=\Box\nabla^c A_c=0 \quad . \tag{10.4.7}$$

If the classical potential is subject to an infinitesimal gauge transformation

$$^f A_b=A_b+\nabla_b f \quad , \tag{10.4.8}$$

the gauge condition (10.4.7) is satisfied by $^f A_b$ if and only if f obeys the fourth-order equation

$$\Box^2 f=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.9}$$

where $\Box^2$ is the $\Box$ operator composed with itself, i.e. $\Box^2\equiv g^{ab}g^{cd}\nabla_a\nabla_b\nabla_c\nabla_d$.

In the quantum theory via path integrals, however, one performs Gaussian averages over gauge functionals $\Phi(A)$ which ensure that well-defined Feynman Green's functions for the $\mathcal{P}$ operator on A_b, and for the ghost operator, actually exist (DeWitt 1981, Esposito et al. 1997). This means that the left-hand side of Eq. (10.4.7) is no longer set to zero. One defines instead a gauge-averaging functional

$$\Phi(A) \equiv \Box \nabla^b A_b \quad , \tag{10.4.10}$$

and the gauge-averaging term $\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}[\Phi(A)]^2$, with β a dimensionful and α a dimensionless parameter, is added to the Maxwell Lagrangian $\frac{1}{4}F_{ab}F^{ab}$. A double integration by parts is then necessary to express the Euclidean Lagrangian in the form $\frac{1}{2}A_b\mathcal{P}^{bc}A_c$, where

$$\mathcal{P}^{bc} \equiv -g^{bc}\Box + \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\Box^2\right)\nabla^b\nabla^c \quad . \tag{10.4.11}$$

The operator $\mathcal{P}^{bc}$ is a complicated sixth-order elliptic operator, and it is unclear how to deal properly with it for finite values of α. However, in the limit as $\alpha \to \infty$, it reduces to the following second-order operator:

$$P^{bc} = -g^{bc}\Box + \nabla^b\nabla^c \quad . \tag{10.4.12}$$

This operator remains non-minimal, since the term $\nabla^b\nabla^c$ survives. In this particular case, we still need to specify boundary conditions on A_b and ghost perturbations. For this purpose, we put to zero at the boundary the whole set of A_b perturbations:

$$\Big[A_b\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \; \forall b = 0, 1, 2, 3 \quad , \tag{10.4.13}$$

and we require invariance of Eq. (10.4.13) under infinitesimal gauge transformations on A_b. This leads to (hereafter τ is a radial coordinate (Esposito et al. 1997))

$$[\varepsilon]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.4.14}$$

$$\Big[\partial\varepsilon/\partial\tau\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.4.15}$$

Condition (10.4.14) results from the gauge invariance of the Dirichlet condition on A_k, $\forall k = 1, 2, 3$, and condition (10.4.15) results from the gauge invariance of the Dirichlet condition on A_0. Note that it would be inconsistent to impose the boundary conditions (10.4.13)–(10.4.15) when the Lorentz gauge-averaging functional is chosen, since the corresponding ghost operator is second-order.

When two boundary three-surfaces occur, Eqs. (10.4.14) and (10.4.15) lead to

$$[\varepsilon]_{\Sigma_1} = [\varepsilon]_{\Sigma_2} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.4.16}$$

$$\Big[\partial\varepsilon/\partial\tau\Big]_{\Sigma_1} = \Big[\partial\varepsilon/\partial\tau\Big]_{\Sigma_2} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.4.17}$$

When Eq. (10.4.10) is used, and the ghost operator is hence $\Box^2$, the four boundary conditions (10.4.16) and (10.4.17) provide enough conditions to determine completely the coefficients $C_1, ..., C_4$ in the linear combination

$$\varepsilon_{(\lambda)} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} C_i \rho_{i_{(\lambda)}} \quad , \tag{10.4.18}$$

where $\rho_1, ..., \rho_4$ are four linearly independent solutions of the fourth-order eigenvalue equation

$$\Box^2 \varepsilon_{(\lambda)} = \lambda \, \varepsilon_{(\lambda)} \quad . \tag{10.4.19}$$

We therefore find that, when the conformally invariant gauge functionals (10.4.10) are used, the admissible boundary conditions differ substantially from the magnetic and electric schemes outlined in Eqs. (10.4.1)–(10.4.3) and (10.4.4)–(10.4.6), and are conformally invariant by construction (with the exception of Eq. (10.4.15)).

Had we set to zero at the boundary A_k ($k = 1, 2, 3$) and the functional (10.4.10), we would not have obtained enough boundary conditions for ghost perturbations, since both choices lead to Dirichlet conditions on the ghost. The boundary conditions (10.4.13) are also very important since they ensure the vanishing of all boundary terms resulting from integration by parts in the Faddeev-Popov action. In the particular case when the three-surface Σ_1 shrinks to a point,

which is relevant for (one-loop) quantum cosmology (Esposito et al. 1997), the boundary conditions read (here Σ is the bounding three-surface)

$$\Big[A_b\Big]_{\Sigma}=0 \quad \forall b=0,1,2,3 \quad , \tag{10.4.20}$$

$$[\varepsilon]_{\Sigma}=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.21}$$

$$\Big[\partial\varepsilon/\partial\tau\Big]_{\Sigma}=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.22}$$

jointly with regularity at $\tau=0$ of A_b, ε and $\frac{\partial\varepsilon}{\partial\tau}$. Many fascinating problems are now in sight. They are as follows:

(i) To prove uniqueness of the solution of the classical boundary-value problem

$$\Box^2 f=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.23}$$

$$[f]_{\Sigma_1}=[f]_{\Sigma_2}=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.24}$$

$$\Big[\partial f/\partial\tau\Big]_{\Sigma_1}=\Big[\partial f/\partial\tau\Big]_{\Sigma_2}=0 \quad . \tag{10.4.25}$$

(ii) To study the quantum theory resulting from the operator (10.4.11) for finite values of α. Interestingly, the Feynman choice $\alpha=1$ does not get rid of the sixth-order nature of the operator $\mathcal{P}^{bc}$.

(iii) To evaluate the one-loop semiclassical approximation, at least when $\mathcal{P}^{bc}$ reduces to the form (10.4.12) in the presence of three-sphere boundaries. The ghost operator is then found to take the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Box^2 = & \frac{\partial^4}{\partial\tau^4}+\frac{6}{\tau}\frac{\partial^3}{\partial\tau^3}+\frac{3}{\tau^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\tau^2}-\frac{3}{\tau^3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} \\ & +\frac{2}{\tau^2}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\tau^2}+\frac{1}{\tau}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\right)_{|i}{}^{|i}+\frac{1}{\tau^4}\Big(_{|i}{}^{|i}\Big)^2 \quad .\end{aligned} \tag{10.4.26}$$

With a standard notation, we denote by $|$ the operation of covariant differentiation tangentially with respect to the three-dimensional Levi-Civita connection of the

boundary (see section 5.2). If one expands the ghost perturbations on a family of three-spheres centred on the origin as (Esposito 1994a–b)

$$\varepsilon(x,\tau)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\varepsilon_n(\tau)Q^{(n)}(x) \quad ,$$

the operator (10.4.26), jointly with the properties of scalar harmonics, leads to the eigenvalue equation (cf. Eq. (10.4.19))

$$\frac{d^4\varepsilon_n}{d\tau^4}+\frac{6}{\tau}\frac{d^3\varepsilon_n}{d\tau^3}-\frac{(2n^2-5)}{\tau^2}\frac{d^2\varepsilon_n}{d\tau^2}$$
$$-\frac{(2n^2+1)}{\tau^3}\frac{d\varepsilon_n}{d\tau}+\left(\frac{(n^2-1)^2}{\tau^4}-\lambda_n\right)\varepsilon_n=0 \quad . \tag{10.4.27}$$

This equation admits a power-series solution in the form

$$\varepsilon_n(\tau)=\tau^{\rho}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}b_{n,k}(n,k,\lambda_n)\tau^k \quad . \tag{10.4.28}$$

The values of ρ are found by solving the fourth-order algebraic equation

$$\rho^4-2(n^2+1)\rho^2+(n^2-1)^2=0 \quad , \tag{10.4.29}$$

which has the four real roots $\pm(n\pm1)$. Moreover, the only non-vanishing $b_{n,k}$ coefficients are of the form $b_{n,4k}$, $\forall k=0,1,2,...$, and are given by (assuming that $b_{n,0}$ has been fixed)

$$b_{n,l}=\frac{\lambda_n\ b_{n,l-4}}{F(l,n,\rho)}\ ,\ \forall l=4,8,12,... \quad , \tag{10.4.30}$$

where we have defined ($\forall k=0,1,2,...$)

$$F(k,n,\rho)\equiv(\rho+k)(\rho+k-1)(\rho+k-2)(\rho+k-3)$$
$$+6(\rho+k)(\rho+k-1)(\rho+k-2)-(2n^2-5)(\rho+k)(\rho+k-1)$$
$$-(2n^2+1)(\rho+k)+(n^2-1)^2 \quad . \tag{10.4.31}$$

As far as we can see, the solution (10.4.28) can be expressed in terms of Bessel functions and modified Bessel functions of order n (cf. section 3.5 of Magnus et al. 1966).

(iv) To include the effects of curvature. As shown in Eastwood and Singer 1985, if the background four-geometry is curved, with Riemann tensor $R^{a}{}_{bcd}$, the conformally invariant gauge-averaging functional reads (cf. Eq. (10.4.10))

$$\Phi(A) \equiv \Box \nabla^{b} A_{b} + \nabla_{c} \left[\left(-2R^{bc} + \frac{2}{3} R g^{bc} \right) A_{b} \right] \quad . \tag{10.4.32}$$

It would be interesting to study the (one-loop) quantum theory, at least when $\alpha \to \infty$, on curved backgrounds like S^4, which is relevant for inflation (Esposito et al. 1997), or $S^2 \times S^2$, which is relevant for the bubbles picture in Euclidean quantum gravity, as proposed in Hawking 1996.

To our knowledge, the form (10.4.11) of the differential operator on perturbations of the electromagnetic potential in the quantum theory, the boundary conditions (10.4.13)–(10.4.15), and the analytic solution (10.4.28)–(10.4.31) for ghost basis functions are entirely new. Thus, quantization via path integrals in conformally invariant gauges possesses some new peculiar properties, which are now under investigation for the first time. This, in turn, seems to add evidence in favor of Euclidean quantum gravity having a deep influence on current developments in quantum field theory (Esposito et al. 1997).

10.5 Conformally Covariant Operators

This section, motivated by the previous example of the conformal gauge for Maxwell theory, is devoted to a brief review of some key properties of conformally covariant operators. An important example is provided by the Paneitz operator. The framework for the introduction of such operator (Paneitz 1983) is a Riemannian manifold (M, g) of dimension $m \geq 3$ with Riemann curvature R, Ricci

curvature ρ and scalar curvature τ. Denoting by d the exterior derivative, and by δ its formal adjoint, the Laplace operator on scalar functions reads

$$\triangle \equiv \delta\, d \quad . \tag{10.5.1}$$

Moreover, one can consider (Branson 1996)

$$J \equiv \frac{\tau}{2(m-1)} \quad , \tag{10.5.2}$$

$$V \equiv \frac{(\rho - Jg)}{(m-2)} \quad , \tag{10.5.3}$$

$$T \equiv (m-2)J - 4V\cdot \quad , \tag{10.5.4}$$

$$Q \equiv \frac{m}{2}J^2 - 2\mid V \mid^2 + \triangle J \quad . \tag{10.5.5}$$

The operation $V\cdot$ is defined by

$$\Big(V\cdot\varphi\Big)_a \equiv V^b_{\ a}\ \varphi_b \quad , \tag{10.5.6}$$

while $\mid V \mid^2 \equiv V^{cd}V_{cd}$, with the indices a, b, c, d ranging from 1 through m. The Weyl tensor, i.e. the part of Riemann which is invariant under conformal rescalings of the metric (and such that all its contractions vanish) can be therefore expressed as

$$C^a_{\ bcd} = R^a_{\ bcd} + V_{bc}\ \delta^a_{\ d} - V_{bd}\ \delta^a_{\ c} + V^a_{\ d}\ g_{bc} - V^a_{\ c}\ g_{bd} \quad . \tag{10.5.7}$$

The Paneitz operator is, by definition, the following fourth-order operator:

$$P \equiv \triangle^2 + \delta T d + \frac{(m-4)}{2}Q \quad . \tag{10.5.8}$$

This operator is *conformally covariant* in that, if the metric is rescaled according to (cf. (5.3.1))

$$g_\omega \equiv e^{2\omega}\ g_0 \quad , \tag{10.5.9}$$

with $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$, then P rescales as

$$P_\omega = e^{-(m+4)\omega/2}\, P_0 \left[e^{(m-4)\omega/2}\right] \quad , \tag{10.5.10}$$

where square brackets are used to denote a multiplication operator, $[F]$, for any $F \in C^\infty(M)$. Indeed, there is an analogy with the construction of the *conformal Laplacian*, defined by

$$Y \equiv \triangle + \frac{(m-2)}{2} J \quad , \tag{10.5.11}$$

which is conformally covariant in that

$$Y_\omega = e^{-(m+2)\omega/2}\, Y_0 \left[e^{(m-2)\omega/2}\right] \quad . \tag{10.5.12}$$

If A is a formally self-adjoint differential operator with positive-definite leading symbol, its order can only be an even number, say $2l > 0$. For a smooth function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, the L^2 trace of fe^{-tA} has an asymptotic expansion as $t \to 0^+$ (cf. section 5.2)

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}\left(fe^{-tA}\right) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t^{(k-m)/2l} \int_M f U_j[A]\, dv \quad , \tag{10.5.13}$$

where dv is the Riemannian measure on M, and the $U_j[A]$ are invariants consisting of a polynomial in the total symbol, whose coefficients are smooth in the leading symbol (Branson 1996). Since M is here assumed to be a manifold without boundary, $U_k[A]$ vanishes for all odd values of k. The condition of conformal covariance for the operator A is that, under the conformal rescaling (10.5.9), A rescales according to the relation

$$\overline{A}_\omega = e^{-b\omega}\, A_0\, [e^{a\omega}] \quad , \tag{10.5.14}$$

for some real parameters a and b.

For the Paneitz operator, the invariant $U_4[P]$ is expressed, after introducing

$$u(m) \equiv 720(m^2-4)(4\pi)^{m/2} \frac{\Gamma((m-4)/2)}{\Gamma((m-4)/4)} \quad , \tag{10.5.15}$$

by (Branson 1996)

$$U_4[P] = u^{-1}(m)\left\{-(m-8)(m+4)(m+2)(m-12)\left[\triangle J + \frac{1}{2}(m-4)J^2\right]\right.$$
$$\left.+(m-8)\Big(m^3-52m-24\Big)Q + 2(m^2-4)|\ C\ |^2\right\} \quad . \tag{10.5.16}$$

In general, if A is conformally covariant, or a power of such (Eastwood and Rice 1987, Baston and Eastwood 1990, Graham et al. 1992, Branson 1995), the number of negative eigenvalues (counted, of course, with their multiplicity), and the multiplicity of 0 as an eigenvalue, are conformal invariants. One can then define the determinant of A by

$$-\log |\ \det A\ | \equiv \zeta'_A(0) \quad , \tag{10.5.17}$$

with

$$\text{sign det } A = \text{number of } \{\lambda_k = 0\} \quad , \tag{10.5.18}$$

where $\zeta_A(s)$ is the analytic continuation to the complex plane of

$$\sum_{\lambda_j \neq 0} |\ \lambda_j\ |^{-s} \quad .$$

One can then study det A as a functional on the conformal class determined by the rescalings (10.5.9), by virtue of the relation

$$\zeta'_{A_\omega}(0) - \zeta'_{A_0}(0) = -\log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0} \quad . \tag{10.5.19}$$

The problem of finding the extremals of the functional determinant within a conformal class is now under intensive investigation (Branson 1996).

Another important reference on conformal geometry and conformally covariant operators is the work by Parker and Rosenberg (1987). More recent developments are described in the work by Avramidi (1997), where the author has studied the structure of diagonal singularities of Green functions of partial differential operators of even order acting on elements of $C^\infty(V, M)$, i.e. smooth sections

of a vector bundle V over a Riemannian manifold M. In particular, the work in Avramidi 1997 has investigated operators obtained by composition of second-order operators of Laplace type (cf. our section 10.4). Interestingly, singularities of the corresponding Green functions have been expressed in terms of heat-kernel coefficients.

10.6 Euclidean Quantum Gravity

The main physical motivations for studying the problem of a quantum theory of gravity (as far as the author can see) are as follows.

(i) Gravity is responsible for the large-scale structure of the universe we live in, and Einstein's theory of general relativity provides a good model of space-time physics, satisfying both mathematical elegance and agreement with observations (Hawking and Ellis 1973, Hawking 1979).

(ii) The formalism of quantum field theory, despite the lack of a rigorous mathematical setting, has led to many exciting developments in the quantum theory of the electromagnetic field and Yang-Mills fields, leading in turn to new results in mathematics (Donaldson and Kronheimer 1990, Freed and Uhlenbeck 1995).

(iii) The application of perturbative or non-perturbative methods to the quantization of Einstein's gravity, or of its supersymmetric version, has shown that formidable technical problems always emerge at some stage, possibly pointing out that all known ideas and methods lead to a mathematically inconsistent formulation of quantum gravity (DeWitt 1965, Hawking 1979, van Nieuwenhuizen 1981, Ashtekar 1988, Ashtekar 1991, Esposito 1994a, Esposito 1995, D'Eath 1996, Esposito et al. 1997).

Nevertheless, decades of efforts by thousands of scientists from all over the world do not seem to have been useless. For example, one knows that the effective action provides, in principle, a tool for studying quantum theory as a theory

of small disturbances of the underlying classical theory, as well as many non-perturbative properties in field theory (Jona-Lasinio 1964, DeWitt 1965, DeWitt 1981, Esposito et al. 1997 and references therein). The basic object of a space-time covariant formulation of quantum gravity may be viewed as being the path-integral representation of the $\langle \text{out} \mid \text{in} \rangle$ amplitude (Hawking 1979), which involves the consideration of ghost fields which reflect the gauge freedom of the classical theory (see Esposito et al. 1997 and the many references therein). In particular, what seems to emerge is that the consideration of the elliptic boundary-value problems of quantum gravity sheds new light on the one-loop semiclassical approximation, which is the "bridge" in between the classical world and the as yet unknown (full) quantum theory (Gibbons and Hawking 1993, Esposito et al. 1997). We shall thus focus on this part of the quantum gravity problem, i.e. the boundary conditions on metric perturbations, when a Riemannian four-manifold with boundary is considered (this may be a portion of flat Euclidean four-space, or part of the de Sitter four-sphere, or a more general curved background). To begin, let us assume that spatial components of metric perturbations, say h_{ij}, are set to zero at the boundary:

$$\Big[h_{ij}\Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.6.1}$$

Of course, this is suggested by what one would do in linearized theory at the classical level. A basic ingredient in our analysis is that Eq. (10.6.1) should be preserved under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms on metric perturbations. Their action on h_{ij} reads (Esposito et al. 1995b, Avramidi et al. 1996, Esposito et al. 1997)

$$^{\varphi}h_{ij} = h_{ij} + \varphi_{(i|j)} + K_{ij}\varphi_0 \quad , \tag{10.6.2}$$

where $\varphi_b dx^b$ is the ghost one-form. It is thus clear that, if the extrinsic-curvature tensor does not vanish, a necessary and sufficient condition for the preservation of the boundary conditions (10.6.1) under the transformations (10.6.2) is that the

following boundary conditions should be imposed on the normal and tangential components of the ghost one-form:

$$\left[\varphi_0\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.6.3}$$

$$\left[\varphi_i\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \tag{10.6.4}$$

At this stage, the remaining set of boundary conditions on metric perturbations, whose invariance under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms

$${}^{\varphi}h_{ab} \equiv h_{ab} + \nabla_{(a}\,\varphi_{b)} \tag{10.6.5}$$

is again guaranteed by Eqs. (10.6.3) and (10.6.4), involves setting to zero at the boundary the gauge-averaging functional, say $\Phi_a(h)$, in the Faddeev-Popov action for Euclidean quantum gravity (Esposito et al. 1997). What happens is that, under the transformations (10.6.5), one finds

$$\Phi_a(h) - \Phi_a({}^{\varphi}h) = \mathcal{F}_a^{\ b}\,\varphi_b \quad , \tag{10.6.6}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_a^{\ b}$ is the ghost operator. If now the ghost one-form is expanded into a complete set of eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{F}_a^{\ b}$, say $\left\{f_b^{(\lambda)}\right\}$, which obey the eigenvalue equations

$$\mathcal{F}_a^{\ b}\,f_b^{(\lambda)} = \lambda\,f_a^{(\lambda)} \quad , \tag{10.6.7}$$

the boundary conditions

$$\left[\Phi_a(h)\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \tag{10.6.8}$$

turn out to be invariant under (10.6.5) if and only if

$$\left[f_a^{(\lambda)}\right]_{\partial M} = 0 \ \ \forall a = 0,1,2,3 \quad , \tag{10.6.9}$$

which implies in turn that (10.6.3) and (10.6.4) should hold, bearing in mind that

$$\varphi_a = \sum_{\lambda} C_\lambda\,f_a^{(\lambda)} \quad , \tag{10.6.10}$$

where C_λ are some constant coefficients.

In particular, if a covariant gauge-averaging functional of the de Donder type is used, i.e.

$$\Phi_a(h) \equiv \nabla^b \Big(h_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ab} g^{cd} h_{cd} \Big) \quad , \tag{10.6.11}$$

the boundary conditions (10.6.8) lead to normal and tangential derivatives of the normal components $n^a n^b h_{ab}$ and $n^b h_{ab}$, where n^b denotes the inward-pointing normal to the boundary of M.

In geometric language, one can say that metric perturbations h_{ab} are sections of the vector bundle V of symmetric rank-two tensors on M. On using the tensor field q_{ab} occurring in Eq. (5.2.9), one can define the projection operator (Avramidi et al. 1996, Moss and Silva 1997)

$$\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv q^c_{(a} \, q^d_{b)} \quad , \tag{10.6.12}$$

and the boundary operator corresponding to (10.6.1) and (10.6.8) may be split as the direct sum (cf. (5.4.2))

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \oplus \mathcal{B}_2 \quad , \tag{10.6.13}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_1$ is proportional to $\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd}$, and takes into account the boundary conditions (cf. (10.6.1))

$$\Big[\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd} \, h_{cd} \Big]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad , \tag{10.6.14}$$

while $\mathcal{B}_2$ reads (Avramidi et al. 1996, Avramidi and Esposito 1997)

$$\mathcal{B}_2 \equiv \Big(\mathbb{1} - \Pi \Big) \left[H \nabla_N + \frac{1}{2} \Big(\Gamma^i \widehat{\nabla}_i + \widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i \Big) + S \right] \quad . \tag{10.6.15}$$

The correct way to interpret $\widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i$ in (10.6.15) is via the Leibniz rule

$$\widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i \, h = \Big(\widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i \Big) h + \Gamma^i \widehat{\nabla}_i h \quad .$$

With our notation, H is the metric on the bundle V, while Γ^i and S are endomorphisms of V. Their form is analyzed in detail in Avramidi et al. 1996, Avramidi

and Esposito 1997. Thus, it is not repeated here, where the emphasis is instead put on some qualitative features. First, note that, if H is replaced by the identity matrix, the operator in square brackets in (10.6.15) reduces to the form first studied in McAvity and Osborn 1991b:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \equiv \nabla_N + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\Gamma^i \widehat{\nabla}_i + \widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i\Big) + S \quad . \tag{10.6.16}$$

At this stage, it is already clear that tangential derivatives lead to a highly non-trivial "invariance theory" (Gilkey 1995). More precisely, we know from section 5.2, which relies in turn on Weyl's theory of the invariants of the orthogonal group (Weyl 1946, Gilkey 1995), that the integrand in the general formulae for interior terms in heat-kernel asymptotics is a polynomial which can be found using only tensor products and contraction of tensor arguments. Thus, by virtue of (10.6.16), it is clear that the integrand in the boundary term in (5.2.18) should be supplemented by

$$f \; K_{ij} \; \Gamma^i \; \Gamma^j \quad ,$$

since this is the only local invariant which is linear in the extrinsic curvature and is built from contractions of K_{ij} with Γ^i. The resulting a_1 coefficient can be denoted, for clarity, by $a_1(f, P, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}})$, where P is an operator of Laplace type (see (5.2.1)).

Similarly, to obtain the form of $a_{3/2}(f, P, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}})$ one has to consider, further to the invariants occurring in (5.2.19), all possible contractions of the matrices Γ^i with geometric objects of the form (K being the second fundamental form of the boundary)

$$fK^2 \;\; , \;\; fKS \;\; , \;\; f\widehat{\nabla}K \;\; , \;\; f\widehat{\nabla}S \;\; , \;\; fR \;\; , \;\; f\Omega \;\; , \;\; f_{;N}K \quad .$$

As shown in Avramidi and Esposito 1997, this leads to 11 new invariants in the general formula for $a_{3/2}(f, P, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}})$. The number of such invariants is rapidly increasing for higher-order heat-kernel coefficients, and the same method shows that 68 new invariants contribute to $a_2(f, P, \widetilde{\mathcal{B}})$ (Avramidi and Esposito 1997). It should be stressed that this property only holds if Γ^i is covariantly constant with respect to

the induced Levi-Civita connection of the boundary (McAvity and Osborn 1991b, Avramidi and Esposito 1997):

$$\widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^j = 0 \quad , \tag{10.6.17}$$

and if Γ^i commutes with both S and Γ^2:

$$\left[\Gamma^i, S\right] = 0 \quad , \tag{10.6.18}$$

$$\left[\Gamma^i, \Gamma^2\right] = 0 \quad . \tag{10.6.19}$$

Under these assumptions, the boundary operator reduces to

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}} \equiv \nabla_N + \Gamma^i \widehat{\nabla}_i + S \quad . \tag{10.6.20}$$

Moreover, all the invariants contributing to interior terms are weighted by *universal functions*, rather than the universal constants of section 5.2. By this we mean functions which depend on the local coordinates on the boundary, whose dependence on Γ^i is realized by means of functions of $\Gamma^2 \equiv \Gamma_i \Gamma^i$. Hence they are not affected by conformal rescalings of the metric, and their contribution to conformal variation formulae is purely algebraic. This point was not appreciated in McAvity and Osborn 1991b, but is investigated in detail in Avramidi and Esposito 1997. Nevertheless, many unsolved problems remain. They are as follows.

(i) The functorial method is, by itself, unable to determine all universal functions. Since tangential derivatives occur in the boundary operator (10.6.20), the universal functions obey an involved set of equations. What is lacking at present is a systematic algorithm for the generation of all such equations. This achievement, jointly with the conformal variation formulae in Avramidi and Esposito 1997, should lead in turn to a complete understanding of heat-kernel asymptotics with the generalized boundary operator (10.6.20).

(ii) Euclidean quantum gravity, however, needs much more, since, with Barvinsky boundary conditions (Barvinsky 1987, Esposito et al. 1995b, Avramidi et al.

1996, Esposito et al. 1997), the boundary operator is expressed by the direct sum (10.6.13), with $\mathcal{B}_2$ given by Eq. (10.6.15). As shown in Avramidi and Esposito 1997, the condition (10.6.19) no longer holds in this case, and hence an infinite number of universal functions seems to contribute to the heat-kernel coefficients $a_{k/2}(f, P, \mathcal{B})$, for all $k \geq 2$.

(iii) Barvinsky boundary conditions turn out to be a particular case of the most general set of BRST-invariant boundary conditions, derived recently by Moss and Silva (1997). The heat-kernel asymptotics corresponding to Moss-Silva boundary conditions remains unknown. In particular, it is unclear whether the existence of infinitely many universal functions is a generic property of Euclidean quantum gravity on manifolds with boundary.

(iv) At the mathematical level, there is also the non-trivial problem of heat-content asymptotics with the boundary operators (10.6.13), or (10.6.16) or (10.6.20). Within this framework, for a given smooth vector bundle V over M, with dual bundle V^*, denoting by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the natural pairing between V and V^*, with $f_1 \in C^\infty(V)$ and $f_2 \in C^\infty(V^*)$, one defines (see (5.2.1))

$$\gamma(f_1, f_2, P, B)(t) \equiv \langle e^{-tP} f_1, f_2 \rangle_{L^2} \quad , \tag{10.6.21}$$

where B is the boundary operator. Following van den Berg and Gilkey 1994 and Gilkey 1995, one knows that, as $t \to 0^+$, γ has an asymptotic expansion

$$\gamma(f_1, f_2, P, B) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} t^{k/2} \, \gamma_k(f_1, f_2, P, B) \quad . \tag{10.6.22}$$

For Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, there exist local invariants such that

$$\gamma_k(f_1, f_2, P, B) = \gamma_k^{(int)}(f_1, f_2, P)[M] + \gamma_k^{(bd)}(f_1, f_2, P, B)[\partial M] \quad . \tag{10.6.23}$$

This corresponds to the (physical) problem of finding the asymptotic expansion of the total heat content of M for a given initial temperature. However, the invariants contributing to Eq. (10.6.23) when the boundary operator B coincides with

(10.6.13), or (10.6.16), or (10.6.20) or with the Moss-Silva boundary operators, have not yet been studied.

From the point of view of theoretical physics, these investigations remain very valuable, since they show that, upon viewing quantum field theory as a theory of small disturbances of the underlying classical theory (DeWitt 1965, DeWitt 1981, Esposito et al. 1997), the problem of finding the first non-trivial corrections to classical field theory is a problem in invariance theory, and the result may be expressed in purely geometric terms. Whether this will be enough to begin a (new) series of substantial achievements in quantum gravity, is a fascinating problem for the years to come.

10.A Appendix

The structure of the $\zeta(0)$ calculation resulting from the eigenvalue condition (10.3.4) is so interesting that we find it appropriate, for completeness, to present a brief outline in this appendix, although a more extensive treatment can be found in D'Eath and Esposito 1991a, Esposito 1994a, Esposito et al. 1997.

The function F occurring in Eq. (10.3.4) can be expressed in terms of its zeros μ_i as (γ being a constant)

$$F(z) = \gamma \, z^{2(n+1)} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{z^2}{\mu_i^2} \right) \quad . \tag{10.A.1}$$

Thus, setting $m \equiv n+2$, one finds

$$J_{m-1}^2(x) - J_m^2(x) = {J'_m}^2 + \left(\frac{m^2}{x^2} - 1 \right) J_m^2 + 2 \frac{m}{x} J_m J'_m \quad . \tag{10.A.2}$$

Thus, on making the analytic continuation $x \to ix$ and then defining $\alpha_m \equiv \sqrt{m^2 + x^2}$, one obtains

$$\log \left[(ix)^{-2(m-1)} \left(J_{m-1}^2 - J_m^2 \right)(ix) \right] \sim - \log(2\pi) + \log(\alpha_m) + 2\alpha_m - 2m \log(m + \alpha_m) + \log(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \; . \tag{10.A.3}$$

In the asymptotic expansion (10.A.3), $\log(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ admits an asymptotic series in the form

$$\log(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \sim \left[\log(c_0) + \frac{A_1}{\alpha_m} + \frac{A_2}{\alpha_m^2} + \frac{A_3}{\alpha_m^3} + ... \right] \quad , \tag{10.A.4}$$

where, on using the Debye polynomials for uniform asymptotic expansions of Bessel functions (Olver 1954), one finds (hereafter, $t \equiv \frac{m}{\alpha_m}$)

$$c_0 = 2(1+t) \quad , \tag{10.A.5}$$

$$A_1 = \sum_{r=0}^{2} k_{1r} t^r \quad , \quad A_2 = \sum_{r=0}^{4} k_{2r} t^r \quad , \quad A_3 = \sum_{r=0}^{6} k_{3r} t^r \quad , \tag{10.A.6}$$

where

$$k_{10} = -\frac{1}{4} \quad k_{11} = 0 \quad k_{12} = \frac{1}{12} \quad , \tag{10.A.7}$$

$$k_{20} = 0 \quad k_{21} = -\frac{1}{8} \quad k_{22} = k_{23} = \frac{1}{8} \quad k_{24} = -\frac{1}{8} \quad , \tag{10.A.8}$$

$$k_{30} = \frac{5}{192} \quad k_{31} = -\frac{1}{8} \quad k_{32} = \frac{9}{320} \quad k_{33} = \frac{1}{2} \quad , \tag{10.A.9}$$

$$k_{34} = -\frac{23}{64} \quad k_{35} = -\frac{3}{8} \quad k_{36} = \frac{179}{576} \quad . \tag{10.A.10}$$

The corresponding ζ-function at large x (Moss 1989) has a uniform asymptotic expansion given by

$$\Gamma(3)\zeta(3, x^2) \sim W_\infty + \sum_{n=5}^{\infty} \hat{q}_n x^{-2-n} \quad , \tag{10.A.11}$$

where, defining

$$S_1(m, \alpha_m(x)) \equiv -\log(\pi) + 2\alpha_m \quad , \tag{10.A.12}$$

$$S_2(m, \alpha_m(x)) \equiv -(2m-1)\log(m + \alpha_m) \quad , \tag{10.A.13}$$

$$S_3(m, \alpha_m(x)) \equiv \sum_{r=0}^{2} k_{1r}\ m^r \alpha_m^{-r-1} \quad , \tag{10.A.14}$$

$$S_4(m,\alpha_m(x)) \equiv \sum_{r=0}^{4} k_{2r}\; m^r \alpha_m^{-r-2} \quad , \tag{10.A.15}$$

$$S_5(m,\alpha_m(x)) \equiv \sum_{r=0}^{6} k_{3r}\; m^r \alpha_m^{-r-3} \quad , \tag{10.A.16}$$

W_∞ can be obtained as

$$W_\infty = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Big(m^2 - m\Big) \left(\frac{1}{2x}\frac{d}{dx}\right)^3 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{5} S_i(m,\alpha_m(x))\right] \quad . \tag{10.A.17}$$

The resulting $\zeta(0)$ value receives contributions from S_2, S_4 and S_5 only, and is given by

$$\zeta(0) = -\frac{1}{120} + \frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=0}^{4} k_{2r} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=0}^{6} k_{3r} = \frac{11}{360} \quad . \tag{10.A.18}$$

Of course, for a massless Dirac field, the full $\zeta(0)$ is twice the value in (10.A.18):

$$\zeta_{\rm Dirac}(0) = \frac{11}{180} \quad . \tag{10.A.19}$$

Remarkably, the same $\zeta(0)$ values are found for a massless spin-1/2 field in a four-sphere background bounded by a three-sphere. The detailed derivation of this property can be found in Kamenshchik and Mishakov 1993, jointly with the analysis in the massive case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Aichelburg P. C. and Urbantke H. K. (1981) Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Trivial Solutions in Supergravity, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **13**, 817–828.

[2] Alexandrov S. and Vassilevich D. V. (1996) Heat Kernel for Non-Minimal Operators on a Kähler Manifold, *J. Math. Phys.* **37**, 5715–5718.

[3] Alvarez-Gaumé L. (1983a) Supersymmetry and The Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **90**, 161–173.

[4] Alvarez-Gaumé L. (1983b) A Note on the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem, *J. Phys.* **A 16**, 4177–4182.

[5] Amsterdamski P. , Berkin A. and O'Connor D. (1989) b_8 Hamidew Coefficient for a Scalar Field, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6**, 1981–1991.

[6] Ashtekar A. (1988) *New Perspectives in Canonical Gravity* (Naples: Bibliopolis).

[7] Ashtekar A. (1991) *Lectures on Non-Perturbative Canonical Gravity* (Singapore: World Scientific).

[8] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1963) The Index of Elliptic Operators on Compact Manifolds, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **69**, 422–433.

[9] Atiyah M. F. and Bott R. (1964) On the Periodicity Theorem for Complex Vector Bundles, *Acta Math.* **112**, 229–247.

[10] Atiyah M. F. and Bott R. H. (1965) The Index Problem for Manifolds with Boundary, in *Differential Analysis*, papers presented at the Bombay Colloquium 1964 (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 175–186.

[11] Atiyah M. F. (1966) Global Aspects of the Theory of Elliptic Differential Operators, in *Proc. Int. Congress of Mathematicians*, Moscow, 57–64.

[12] Atiyah M. F. (1967) *K-Theory* (New York: Benjamin).

[13] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1968a) The Index of Elliptic Operators: I, *Ann. of Math.* **87**, 484–530.

[14] Atiyah M. F. and Segal G. B. (1968) The Index of Elliptic Operators: II, *Ann. of Math.* **87**, 531–545.

[15] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1968b) The Index of Elliptic Operators: III, *Ann. of Math.* **87**, 546–604.

[16] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1971a) The Index of Elliptic Operators: IV, *Ann. of Math.* **93**, 119–138.

[17] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1971b) The Index of Elliptic Operators: V, *Ann. of Math.* **93**, 139–149.

[18] Atiyah M. F. and Patodi V. K. (1973) On the Heat Equation and the Index Theorem, *Inventiones Math.* **19**, 279–330 [Erratum in *Inventiones Math.* **28**, 277–280].

[19] Atiyah M. F. (1975a) Classical Groups and Classical Differential Operators on Manifolds, in *Differential Operators on Manifolds*, CIME, Varenna 1975 (Roma: Edizione Cremonese) 5–48.

[20] Atiyah M. F. (1975b) Eigenvalues and Riemannian Geometry, in *Proc. Int. Conf. on Manifolds and Related Topics in Topology* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press) 5–9.

[21] Atiyah M. F. , Patodi V. K. and Singer I. M. (1975) Spectral Asymmetry and Riemannian Geometry I, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **77**, 43–69.

[22] Atiyah M. F. , Patodi V. K. and Singer I. M. (1976) Spectral Asymmetry and Riemannian Geometry III, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **79**, 71–99.

[23] Atiyah M. F. (1984) Anomalies and Index Theory, in *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. **208** (Berlin: Springer-Verlag) 313–322.

[24] Atiyah M. F. and Singer I. M. (1984) Dirac Operators Coupled to Vector Potentials, *Proc. Nat. Acad. of Sci. USA* **81**, 2597–2600.

[25] Atiyah M. F. (1985) Eigenvalues of the Dirac Operator, in *Proc. of 25th Mathematics Arbeitstagung, Bonn 1984, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag) 251–260.

[26] Avis S. J. and Isham C. J. (1980) Generalized Spin-Structures on Four-Dimensional Space-Times, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **72**, 103–118.

[27] Avramidi I. G. (1989) Background Field Calculations in Quantum Field Theory (Vacuum Polarization), *Theor. Math. Phys.* **79**, 494–502.

[28] Avramidi I. G. (1990a) The Non-Local Structure of One-Loop Effective Action via Partial Summation of Asymptotic Expansion, *Phys. Lett.* **B 236**, 443–449.

[29] Avramidi I. G. (1990b) The Covariant Technique for Calculation of the Heat-Kernel Asymptotic Expansion, *Phys. Lett.* **B 238**, 92–97.

[30] Avramidi I. G. (1991) A Covariant Technique for the Calculation of the One-Loop Effective Action, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 355**, 712–754.

[31] Avramidi I. G. , Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1996) Boundary Operators in Euclidean Quantum Gravity, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 2361–2373.

[32] Avramidi I. G. and Esposito G. (1997) Heat-Kernel Asymptotics with Generalized Boundary Conditions (hep-th/9701018).

[33] Avramidi I. G. (1997) Singularities of Green Functions of the Products of the Laplace Type Operators (hep-th/9703005).

[34] Barvinsky A. O. (1987) The Wave Function and the Effective Action in Quantum Cosmology: Covariant Loop Expansion, *Phys. Lett.* **B 195**, 344–348.

[35] Barvinsky A. O. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Karmazin I. P. (1992) One-Loop Quantum Cosmology: ζ-Function Technique for the Hartle-Hawking Wave Function of the Universe, *Ann. Phys.* **219**, 201–242.

[36] Baston R. J. and Eastwood M. (1990) Invariant Operators, in *Twistors in Mathematics and Physics*, L.M.S. Lecture Notes **156**, eds. T. N. Bailey and R. J. Baston (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[37] Bérard P. H. (1986) *Spectral Geometry: Direct and Inverse Problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1207 (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[38] Berline N. , Getzler E. and Vergne M. (1992) *Heat Kernels and Dirac Operators* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[39] Booss B. and Bleecker D. D. (1985) *Topology and Analysis: The Atiyah-Singer Index Formula and Gauge-Theoretic Physics* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[40] Booss-Bavnbek B. and Wojciechowski K. P. (1993) *Elliptic Boundary Problems for Dirac Operators* (Boston: Birkhäuser).

[41] Bott R. (1959) The Stable Homotopy of the Classical Groups, *Ann. of Math.* **70**, 313–337.

[42] Boyer T. H. (1968) Quantum Electromagnetic Zero-Point Energy of a Conducting Spherical Shell and the Casimir Model for a Charged Particle, *Phys. Rev.* **174**, 1764–1776.

[43] Branson T. P. , Gilkey P. B. and Orsted B. (1990) Leading Terms in the Heat Invariants, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **109**, 437–450.

[44] Branson T. P. and Gilkey P. B. (1990) The Asymptotics of the Laplacian on a Manifold with Boundary, *Commun. in Partial Differential Equations* **15**, 245–272.

[45] Branson T. P. and Gilkey P. B. (1992a) Residues of the η-Function for an Operator of Dirac Type, *J. Funct. Anal.* **108**, 47–87.

[46] Branson T. P. and Gilkey P. B. (1992b) Residues of the η-Function for an Operator of Dirac Type with Local Boundary Conditions, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **2**, 249–267.

[47] Branson T. P. (1995) Sharp Inequalities, the Functional Determinant, and the Complementary Series, *Trans. A. M. S.* **347**, 3671–3742.

[48] Branson T. P. (1996) An Anomaly Associated with Four-Dimensional Quantum Gravity, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **178**, 301–309.

[49] Branson T. P. , Gilkey P. B. and Vassilevich D. V. (1997) Vacuum Expectation Value Asymptotics for Second-Order Differential Operators on Manifolds with Boundary (hep-th/9702178).

[50] Breitenlohner P. and Freedman D. Z. (1982) Stability in Gauged Extended Supergravity, *Ann. Phys.* **144**, 249–281.

[51] Camporesi R. and Higuchi A. (1996) On the Eigenfunctions of the Dirac Operator on Spheres and Real Hyperbolic Spaces, *J. Geom. Phys.* **20**, 1–18.

[52] Carow-Watamura U. and Watamura S. (1997) Chirality and Dirac Operator on Non-Commutative Sphere, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **183**, 365–382.

[53] Carslaw H. S. and Jaeger J. C. (1959) *Conduction of Heat in Solids* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

[54] Casimir H. B. G. (1948) On the Attraction Between Two Perfectly Conducting Plates, *Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetenschap.* , ser. B, **51**, 793–795.

[55] Chern S. S. (1944) A Simple Intrinsic Proof of the Gauss-Bonnet Formula for Closed Riemannian Manifolds, *Ann. of Math.* **45**, 741–752.

[56] Chern S. S. (1945) On the Curvatura Integra in a Riemannian Manifold, *Ann. of Math.* **46**, 674–684.

[57] Chern S. S. (1979) *Complex Manifolds Without Potential Theory* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[58] Chernoff P. R. (1977) Schrödinger and Dirac Operators with Singular Potentials and Hyperbolic Equations, *Pacific J. Math.* **72**, 361–382.

[59] Chodos A. , Jaffe R. L. , Johnson K. , Thorn C. B. and Weisskopf V. F. (1974) New Extended Model of Hadrons, *Phys. Rev.* **D 9**, 3471–3495.

[60] Connes A. (1995) Non-Commutative Geometry and Physics, in *Gravitation and Quantizations, Les Houches Session LVII*, eds. B. Julia and J. Zinn-Justin (Amsterdam: Elsevier) 805–950.

[61] D'Eath P. D. (1984) Canonical Quantization of Supergravity, *Phys. Rev.* **D 29**, 2199–2219.

[62] D'Eath P. D. and Halliwell J. J. (1987) Fermions in Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D 35**, 1100–1123.

[63] D'Eath P. D. and Esposito G. (1991a) Local Boundary Conditions for the Dirac Operator and One-Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D 43**, 3234–3248.

[64] D'Eath P. D. and Esposito G. (1991b) Spectral Boundary Conditions in One-Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D 44**, 1713–1721.

[65] D'Eath P. D. (1996) *Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[66] Deser S. and Zumino B. (1976) Consistent Supergravity, *Phys. Lett.* **62 B**, 335–337.

[67] DeWitt B. S. (1965) *Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields* (New York: Gordon and Breach).

[68] DeWitt B. S. (1981) A Gauge-Invariant Effective Action, in *Quantum Gravity 2, A Second Oxford Symposium*, eds. C. J. Isham, R. Penrose and D. W. Sciama (Oxford: Clarendon Press) 449–487.

[69] Dirac P. A. M. (1928) The Quantum Theory of the Electron, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **A 117**, 610–624.

[70] Dirac P. A. M. (1958) *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

[71] Donaldson S. K. and Kronheimer P. B. (1990) *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

[72] Dowker J. S. and Schofield J. P. (1990) Conformal Transformations and the Effective Action in the Presence of Boundaries, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 808–818.

[73] Dowker J. S. (1996) Spin on the Four-Ball, *Phys. Lett.* **B 366**, 89–94.

[74] Dowker J. S. , Apps J. S. , Kirsten K. and Bordag M. (1996) Spectral Invariants for the Dirac Equation on the d-Ball with Various Boundary Conditions, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 2911–2920.

[75] Eastwood M. and Singer I. M. (1985) A Conformally Invariant Maxwell Gauge, *Phys. Lett.* **A 107**, 73–74.

[76] Eastwood M. and Rice J. (1987) Conformally Invariant Differential Operators on Minkowski Space and their Curved Analogues, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **109**, 207–228 [Erratum in *Commun. Math. Phys.* **144**, 213].

[77] Eisenhart L. P. (1926) *Riemannian Geometry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

[78] Endo R. (1995) Heat Kernel for Spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ Rarita-Schwinger Field in General Covariant Gauge, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12**, 1157–1164.

[79] Esposito G. (1994a) *Quantum Gravity, Quantum Cosmology and Lorentzian Geometries*, Lecture Notes in Physics, New Series m: Monographs, Vol. m12, second corrected and enlarged edition (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[80] Esposito G. (1994b) Gauge-Averaging Functionals for Euclidean Maxwell Theory in the Presence of Boundaries, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11**, 905–926.

[81] Esposito G. and Pollifrone G. (1994) Spin-Raising Operators and Spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ Potentials in Quantum Cosmology, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11**, 897–903.

[82] Esposito G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. , Mishakov I. V. and Pollifrone G. (1994a) Euclidean Maxwell Theory in the Presence of Boundaries. II, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **11**, 2939–2950.

[83] Esposito G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. , Mishakov I. V. and Pollifrone G. (1994b) Gravitons in One-Loop Quantum Cosmology. Correspondence Between Covariant and Non-Covariant Formalisms, *Phys. Rev.* **D 50**, 6329–6337.

[84] Esposito G. (1995) *Complex General Relativity*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Vol. 69 (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

[85] Esposito G. , Gionti G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. , Mishakov I. V. and Pollifrone G. (1995) Spin-3/2 Potentials in Backgrounds with Boundary, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D 4**, 735–747.

[86] Esposito G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. , Mishakov I. V. and Pollifrone G. (1995a) Relativistic Gauge Conditions in Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52**, 2183–2191.

[87] Esposito G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. , Mishakov I. V. and Pollifrone G. (1995b) One-Loop Amplitudes in Euclidean Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52**, 3457–3465.

[88] Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1995) Mixed Boundary Conditions in Euclidean Quantum Gravity, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12**, 2715–2722.

[89] Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1996) One-Loop Divergences in Simple Supergravity: Boundary Effects, *Phys. Rev.* **D 54**, 3869–3881.

[90] Esposito G. , Morales-Técotl H. A. and Pimentel L. O. (1996) Essential Self-Adjointness in One-Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 957–963.

[91] Esposito G. and Pollifrone G. (1996) Twistors in Conformally Flat Einstein Four-Manifolds, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D 5**, 481–493.

[92] Esposito G. (1996) Local Boundary Conditions in Quantum Supergravity, *Phys. Lett.* **B 389**, 510–514.

[93] Esposito G. (1996) Quantized Maxwell Theory in a Conformally Invariant Gauge (hep-th/9610017).

[94] Esposito G. (1997) Non-Local Boundary Conditions for Massless Spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Fields, *Phys. Rev.* **D 55**, 3886–3888.

[95] Esposito G. , Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Pollifrone G. (1997) *Euclidean Quantum Gravity on Manifolds with Boundary*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Vol. 85 (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

[96] Falomir H. , Gamboa Saraví R. E. , Muschietti M. A. , Santangelo E. M. and Solomin J. E. (1996) Determinants of Dirac Operators with Local Boundary Conditions, *J. Math. Phys.* **37**, 5805–5819.

[97] Falomir H. , Gamboa Saraví R. E. and Santangelo E. M. (1996) Dirac Operator on a Disk with Global Boundary Conditions (hep-th/9609194).

[98] Falomir H. (1996) Condiciones de Contorno Globales Para el Operator de Dirac (hep-th/9612155).

[99] Freed D. S. and Uhlenbeck K. K. (1995) *Geometry and Quantum Field Theory* (American Mathematical Society).

[100] Fursaev D. V. (1994) Spectral Geometry and One-Loop Divergences on Manifolds with Conical Singularities, *Phys. Lett.* **B 334**, 53–60.

[101] Gibbons G. W. and Hawking S. W. (1993) *Euclidean Quantum Gravity* (Singapore: World Scientific).

[102] Gilkey P. B. (1975) The Spectral Geometry of a Riemannian Manifold, *J. Diff. Geom.* **10**, 601–618.

[103] Gilkey P. B. (1995) *Invariance Theory, the Heat Equation, and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem* (Boca-Raton: Chemical Rubber Company).

[104] Graham C. R. , Jenne R. , Mason L. J. and Sparling G. A. J. (1992) Conformally Invariant Powers of the Laplacian. I: Existence, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **46**, 557–565.

[105] Greiner P. (1971) An Asymptotic Expansion for the Heat Equation, *Archs. Ration. Mech. Analysis* **41**, 163–218.

[106] Greub W. , Halperin S. and Vanstone R. (1973) *Connections, Curvature and Cohomology*, Vol. II (New York: Academic).

[107] Grib A. A. , Mamaev S. G. and Mostepanenko V. M. (1994) *Vacuum Quantum Effects in Strong Fields* (St. Petersburg: Friedmann Laboratory Publishing).

[108] Grubb G. (1996) *Functional Calculus for Boundary-Value Problems* (Boston: Birkhauser).

[109] Hartle J. B. and Hawking S. W. (1983) Wave Function of the Universe, *Phys. Rev.* **D 28**, 2960–2975.

[110] Hawking S. W. and Ellis G. F. R. (1973) *The Large-Scale Structure of Space-Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[111] Hawking S. W. (1977) Zeta-Function Regularization of Path Integrals in Curved Space-Time, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55**, 133–148.

[112] Hawking S. W. (1979) The Path-Integral Approach to Quantum Gravity, in *General Relativity, an Einstein Centenary Survey*, eds. S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 746–789.

[113] Hawking S. W. (1982) The Boundary Conditions of the Universe, in *Pontificiae Academiae Scientiarum Scripta Varia* **48**, 563–574.

[114] Hawking S. W. (1983) The Boundary Conditions for Gauged Supergravity, *Phys. Lett.* **126 B**, 175–177.

[115] Hawking S. W. (1984) The Quantum State of the Universe, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 239**, 257–276.

[116] Hawking S. W. (1996) Virtual Black Holes, *Phys. Rev* **D 53**, 3099–3107.

[117] Hörmander L. (1963) *Linear Partial Differential Operators* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[118] Hortacsu M. , Rotke K. D. and Schroer B. (1980) Zero-Energy Eigenstates for the Dirac Boundary Problem, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 171**, 530–542.

[119] Isham C. J. (1978) Spinor Fields in Four-Dimensional Space-Time, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **A 364**, 591–599.

[120] Johnson K. (1975) The M. I. T. Bag Model, *Acta Phys. Polonica* **B 6**, 865–892.

[121] Jona-Lasinio G. (1964) Relativistic Field Theories with Symmetry-Breaking Solutions, *Nuovo Cimento* **34**, 1790–1795.

[122] Kac M. (1966) Can One Hear the Shape of a Drum ? , *Amer. Math. Monthly* **73**, 1–23.

[123] Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Mishakov I. V. (1992) ζ-Function Technique for Quantum Cosmology: The Contributions of Matter Fields to the Hartle-Hawking Wave Function of the Universe, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 7**, 3713–3746.

[124] Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Mishakov I. V. (1993) Fermions in One-Loop Quantum Cosmology, *Phys. Rev.* **D 47**, 1380–1390.

[125] Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Mishakov I. V. (1994) Fermions in One-Loop Quantum Cosmology II. The Problem of Correspondence Between Covariant and Non-Covariant Formalisms, *Phys. Rev.* **D 49**, 816–824.

[126] Kennedy G. (1978) Boundary Terms in the Schwinger-DeWitt Expansion: Flat-Space Results, *J. Phys.* **A 11**, L173–L178.

[127] Kirsten K. and Cognola G. (1996) Heat-Kernel Coefficients and Functional Determinants for Higher-Spin Fields on the Ball, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 633–644.

[128] Lamoreaux S. K. (1997) Demonstration of the Casimir Force in the 0.6 to 6 μm Range, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5–8.

[129] Landi G. and Rovelli C. (1996) General Relativity in Terms of Dirac Eigenvalues (gr-qc 9612034).

[130] Lewandowski J. (1991) Twistor Equation in a Curved Space-Time, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, L11–L17.

[131] Luckock H. C. and Moss I. G. (1989) The Quantum Geometry of Random Surfaces and Spinning Membranes, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6**, 1993–2027.

[132] Luckock H. C. (1991) Mixed Boundary Conditions in Quantum Field Theory, *J. Math. Phys.* **32**, 1755–1766.

[133] Magnus W. , Oberhettinger F. and Soni R. P. (1966) *Formulas and Theorems for the Special Functions of Mathematical Physics* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[134] Marachevsky V. N. and Vassilevich D. V. (1996) A Diffeomorphism-Invariant Eigenvalue Problem for Metric Perturbations in a Bounded Region, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 645–652.

[135] Martellini M. and Reina C. (1985) Some Remarks on the Index Theorem Approach to Anomalies, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **43**, 443–458.

[136] McAvity D. M. and Osborn H. (1991a) A DeWitt Expansion of the Heat Kernel for Manifolds with a Boundary, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 603–638.

[137] McAvity D. M. and Osborn H. (1991b) Asymptotic Expansion of the Heat Kernel for Generalized Boundary Conditions, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 1445–1454.

[138] Milnor J. W. (1963) Spin-Structures on Manifolds, *Enseign. Math.* **9**, 198–203.

[139] Milnor J. W. and Stasheff J. D. (1974) *Characteristic Classes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

[140] Minakshisundaram S. and Pleijel A. (1949) Some Properties of the Eigenfunctions of the Laplace Operator on Riemannian Manifolds, *Can. J. Math.* **1**, 242–256.

[141] Moniz P. (1996) Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology: Shaken not Stirred, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 11**, 4321–4382.

[142] Moss I. G. (1989) Boundary Terms in the Heat-Kernel Expansion, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **6**, 759–765.

[143] Moss I. G. and Dowker J. S. (1989) The Correct B_4 Coefficient, *Phys. Lett.* **B 229**, 261–263.

[144] Moss I. G. and Poletti S. (1994) Conformal Anomalies on Einstein Spaces with Boundary, *Phys. Lett.* **B 333**, 326–330.

[145] Moss I. G. (1996) *Quantum Theory, Black Holes and Inflation* (New York: John Wiley and Sons).

[146] Moss I. G. and Silva P. J. (1997) BRST Invariant Boundary Conditions for Gauge Theories, *Phys. Rev.* **D 55**, 1072–1078.

[147] Olver F. W. J. (1954) On Bessel Functions of Large Order, *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London* **A 247**, 328–368.

[148] Paneitz S. (1983) A Quartic Conformally Covariant Differential Operator for Arbitrary Pseudo-Riemannian Manifolds (preprint).

[149] Parker T. and Rosenberg S. (1987) Invariants of Conformal Laplacians, *J. Diff. Geom.* **25**, 199–222.

[150] Penrose R. and Rindler W. (1984) *Spinors and Space-Time, Vol. I: Two-Spinor Calculus and Relativistic Fields* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[151] Penrose R. and Rindler W. (1986) *Spinors and Space-Time, Vol. II: Spinor and Twistor Methods in Space-Time Geometry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[152] Penrose R. (1991) Twistors as Spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ Charges, in *Gravitation and Modern Cosmology*, eds. A. Zichichi, V. de Sabbata and N. Sánchez (New York: Plenum Press) 129–137.

[153] Penrose R. (1994) Twistors and the Einstein Equations, in *Twistor Theory*, ed. S. Huggett (New York: Marcel Dekker) 145–157.

[154] Perry M. J. (1984) The Positive Mass Theorem and Black Holes, in *Asymptotic Behaviour of Mass and Space-Time Geometry*, ed. F. J. Flaherty (Berlin: Springer-Verlag) 31–40.

[155] Piazza P. (1991) K-Theory and Index Theory on Manifolds with Boundary, Ph.D. Thesis, M. I. T.

[156] Piazza P. (1993) On the Index of Elliptic Operators on Manifolds with Boundary, *J. Funct. Anal.* **117**, 308–359.

[157] Polychronakos A. P. (1987) Boundary Conditions, Vacuum Quantum Numbers and the Index Theorem, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 283**, 268–294.

[158] Rarita W. and Schwinger J. (1941) On a Theory of Particles with Half-Integral Spin, *Phys. Rev.* **60**, 61.

[159] Reed M. and Simon B. (1975) *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. II: Fourier Analysis and Self-Adjointness* (New York: Academic).

[160] Rennie R. (1990) Geometry and Topology of Chiral Anomalies in Gauge Theories, *Adv. Phys.* **39**, 617–779.

[161] Schleich K. (1985) Semiclassical Wave Function of the Universe at Small Three-Geometries *Phys. Rev.* **D 32**, 1889–1898.

[162] Schwinger J. (1951) On Gauge Invariance and Vacuum Polarization, *Phys. Rev.* **82**, 664–679.

[163] Seeley R. T. (1967) Complex Powers of an Elliptic Operator, *Amer. Math. Soc. Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **10**, 288–307.

[164] Siklos S. T. C. (1985) Lobatchevski Plane Gravitational Waves, in *Galaxies, Axisymmetric Systems and Relativity*, ed. M. A. H. MacCallum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 247–274.

[165] Spanier E. H. (1966) *Algebraic Topology* (New York: McGraw Hill).

[166] Sparnay M. J. (1958) Measurements of Attractive Forces Between Flat Plates, *Physica* **24**, 751–764.

[167] Stewart J. M. (1991) *Advanced General Relativity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[168] Stewartson K. and Waechter R. T. (1971) On Hearing the Shape of a Drum: Further Results, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **69**, 353–363.

[169] Townsend P. K. (1977) Cosmological Constant in Supergravity, *Phys. Rev.* **D 15**, 2802–2805.

[170] Vafa C. and Witten E. (1984) Eigenvalue Inequalities for Fermions in Gauge Theories, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **95**, 257–276.

[171] van den Berg M. and Gilkey P. B. (1994) Heat Content Asymptotics of a Riemannian Manifold with Boundary, *J. Funct. Anal.* **120**, 48–71.

[172] van Nieuwenhuizen P. and Vermaseren J. A. M. (1976) One-Loop Divergences in the Quantum Theory of Supergravity, *Phys. Lett.* **65 B**, 263–266.

[173] van Nieuwenhuizen P. (1981) Supergravity, *Phys. Rep.* **68**, 189–398.

[174] Vassilevich D. V. (1995a) Vector Fields on a Disk With Mixed Boundary Conditions, *J. Math. Phys.* **36**, 3174–3182.

[175] Vassilevich D. V. (1995b) QED on a Curved Background and on Manifolds with Boundary: Unitarity Versus Covariance, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52**, 999–1010.

[176] Waechter R. T. (1972) On Hearing the Shape of a Drum: an Extension to Higher Dimensions, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **72**, 439.

[177] Ward R. S. and Wells R. O. (1990) *Twistor Geometry and Field Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

[178] Weidmann J. (1980) *Linear Operators in Hilbert Spaces* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).

[179] Weyl H. (1946) *The Classical Groups: Their Invariants and Representations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

[180] Wigner E. P. (1959) *Group Theory and Its Application to the Quantum Mechanics of Atomic Spectra* (New York: Academic).

[181] Witten E. (1982) Constraints on Supersymmetry Breaking, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 202**, 253–316.

[182] Woodhouse N. M. J. (1985) Real Methods in Twistor Theory, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **2**, 257–291.

[183] York J. W. (1986) Boundary Terms in the Action Principles of General Relativity, *Found. Phys.* **16**, 249–257.